

India on the Brink

by

A British-India Merchant

LONDON

P. S. KING & SON, LTD.

ORCHARD HOUSE, WESTMINSTER

1931 ~

present, the seed of that poisonous plant—false rumour—was sown by a comparative handful of irreconcilable extremists on the fertile soil of a people, 90 per cent. of whom can neither read nor write, and was manured by a revolutionary Press which for years has abused its freedom from restraint in a manner no other country would have tolerated. In the past these periods of unrest have yielded to firm though just and sympathetic treatment: if like treatment be applied at the present time, India should be cured ere long of her present malady.

On the 20th August, 1917, Mr. Montagu, the Secretary of State for India in the Coalition Government, announced in the House of Commons that :

“ the policy of His Majesty’s Government, with which the Government of India are in complete accord, is that of the increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration and the general development of self-governing institutions, with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible government in India as an *integral part of the British Empire.*”

Mr. Montagu subsequently visited India, Lord Chelmsford then being the Viceroy, and they jointly issued the Montagu–Chelmsford Report, as the result of which the Government of India Act, 1919, “ was passed by both Houses of Parliament without a division being challenged at any cardinal stage.” (S. R.)

The Act declared as follows :

“ Whereas it is the declared policy of Parliament to provide for the increasing association of Indians in every branch of Indian Administration, and for the gradual

development of self-governing institutions, with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible government in British India as an integral part of the Empire :

“ And whereas progress in giving effect to this policy can only be achieved by successive stages, and it is expedient that substantial steps in this direction should now be taken :

“ And whereas the time and manner of each advance can be determined only by Parliament, upon whom responsibility lies for the welfare and advancement of the Indian peoples :

“ And whereas the action of Parliament in such matters must be guided by the co-operation received from those on whom new opportunities of service will be conferred, and by the extent to which it is found that confidence can be reposed in their sense of responsibility :

“ And whereas concurrently with the gradual development of self-governing institutions in the Provinces of India it is expedient to give to those Provinces in provincial matters the largest measure of independence of the Government of India which is compatible with the due discharge by the latter of its own responsibilities.”

This is therefore the policy to which the British nation is pledged, and which it is prepared to implement as soon as the conditions laid down by Parliament are complied with. These conditions, it will be noted, are :

(1) Progressive realisation of responsible Government in British India as an *integral part of the Empire*.

(2) Progress to be achieved by *successive stages, the time and manner of each advance to be determined by Parliament, who must be guided in such matters by the co-operation received from the Indian people themselves*.

The new Constitution was inaugurated at Delhi.

by H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught at the close of 1920. It therefore has been in existence now for ten years.

How did the leaders of the national movement avail themselves of this great opportunity for a steady advance towards their professed goal? The answer to this question is supplied by the Indian Statutory Commission's Report :

"The elections to the new Legislatures were held at the beginning of the non-co-operation movement. The Nationalist party had joined the movement, and consistently with its programme its members did not stand as candidates. Every effort was made to throw contempt upon the elections, but the attempt failed. The field was left open to the Moderates, who were returned in preponderating numbers, both to the Central Legislature and the Provincial Councils."

In 1923 the second election to the Legislatures took place, when certain of the Congress leaders,

"conscious of the failure of non-co-operation, and it may be alive to its dangers, now turned to a new method of embarrassing Government; they offered themselves as candidates for the Assembly and for the Provincial Councils on a pledge of

'Uniform continuous and consistent obstruction with a view to making Government through the Assembly and the Councils impossible.'

For the policy of boycott was to be substituted one of wrecking the Legislatures from within; Congress laid down, that members of the party in the Legislature should *pursue a policy of pure obstruction*; no member was to accept office or a seat on a Select Committee or to take part as an individual in current business." (S. R.)

This irreconcilable attitude was in flagrant

Sketch Map of India



India on the Brink

defiance of the preamble of the Government of India Act, 1919, which stipulated that the rate of progress towards complete self-government must depend on :

“ the co-operation received from those on whom new opportunities of service will be conferred, and by the extent to which it is found that confidence can be reposed in their sense of responsibility.”

To all those who have time to read and digest two volumes comprising over 700 pages, I would earnestly recommend the perusal of the Report of the Indian Statutory Commission, to which for brevity I shall refer hereafter as the “ Simon Report.”

The first volume furnishes an exhaustive review of the Indian problem ; the second volume contains the Commission's recommendations.

I shall quote the Commission's conclusions on certain vital points, and for identification will mark quotations from the Simon Report (S. R.) and from the Montagu-Chelmsford Report (M. C.).

The Indian Statutory Commission was appointed by Royal Warrant on the 27th December, 1927, to inquire :

“ into the working of the system of Government, the growth of education and the development of representative Institutions in British India, and matters connected therewith, reporting as to whether and to what extent it is desirable to establish the principle of responsible Government or to extend the method or restrict the degree of the responsible Government then existing therein, including the question whether the establishment of Second Chambers of the local Legislatures is or is not desirable.”

The Commission, after twice visiting India, issued its Report and recommendations.

Subsequently H.M. Government convened the Round Table Conference, to which they invited "representatives of *all parties and interests* in British India and representatives of the Indian States," and at which they made it known that "the free representation of all points of view" would be permitted.

The Conference obviously was convened in the hope that frank discussion between representatives of the numerous Indian communities which hitherto have been unable to agree among themselves would enable them to compose their differences, and in collaboration with representatives of the Government of India and the Indian States—

"agree upon the principles which in advance should be applied to Indian Government and which should be made the foundation of any Constitution that should ultimately be drafted." (Ramsay MacDonald.)

The Conference was in Session for ten weeks, and during its proceedings it soon became evident that no definite recommendations could be formulated at this stage, especially on the one vital issue of "safeguards." The result of its labours is expressed in the following resolution passed on the eve of its dissolution :

"The Conference, sitting in plenary session, has received and noted the reports of the sub-committees submitted by the Committee of the whole Conference with comments thereon. These reports, provisional though they are, together with the recorded notes attached to them, afford in the opinion of the Conference

material of the highest value for use in the framing of a Constitution for India, embodying as they do a substantial measure of agreement on the main ground plan and many helpful indications of the points of detail to be further pursued; and the Conference feels that arrangements should be made to pursue without interruption the work upon which it has been engaged, including the provision in the Constitution of adequate safeguards for the Mussulmans, Depressed Classes, Sikhs, and all other important minorities."

In the Parliamentary debate on the results of the Round Table Conference, commenting on the problem of "safeguards," Sir John Simon said :

"He could not regard *unformulated* safeguards on vital matters as mere questions of detail. The formulation of how these safeguards were to be worked into the scheme was really of the essence of the scheme itself. They were fundamental to the contents of any future Indian Constitution, and he did not believe that even the broad outline of an Indian Constitution could be regarded as satisfactorily laid down until these main matters approached nearer to settlement."

In his speech at the final Session of the Conference the Prime Minister said to the Delegates :

"Now we have gone as far as we can go at this moment : you have to go back to India ; we have to go back to our own public opinion. You have spoken here subject to reconsideration, subject to the reaction which your public opinion will show to your work ; we, Government and Parliamentary representatives alike, have spoken in the same way and we must also listen to reactions."

The Prime Minister was wise in making the above reservation, as the *Indian National Congress Party*,

which alone is responsible for the present campaign of lawlessness, *definitely declined to be represented at the Round Table Conference* unless India was to be permitted "to sever at will" its connection with the British Empire and repudiate at will "the whole field of British claims, including the public debt of India" (Gandhi).

Not satisfied with refusing the invitation to the Conference, the Congress convened meetings to express public condemnation of those attending it, whom they described as men "representing narrow sectional interests discredited and disowned by the nation."

It is to this hostile environment that the Indian Delegates are returning, and in this unhealthy atmosphere they have first to reconcile the conflicting claims of the communities they respectively represent and then to attempt what at present appears to be the hopeless task of bringing back to sanity the Congress leaders. Many of these leaders, who had been imprisoned for breaking the law, the Government of India has just released unconditionally; it now rests with these leaders to prove by their words and deeds that Government was justified in taking this conciliatory action.

The Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms made great concessions to Indian aspirations, yet their effect was merely to strengthen the hands of the extremists, whose demands became increasingly impossible. I fear that the majority of Orientals construe any concession as a sign of weakness. That is the danger of making concessions; one cannot foretell whither they

will lead. It is well, therefore, that the Prime Minister made it clear to the Delegates that all speeches at the Conference were made "subject to reconsideration" and to "the reaction of public opinion."

If ultimately sufficient unanimity is achieved amongst the representatives of the two leading Indian communities and of the Minority communities, to formulate a scheme for a Federal Constitution that will be acceptable to all of them, then it must be submitted for approval, modification or rejection to the British Houses of Parliament, whose decision will be final and unquestionably will settle the course of events in India for many years to come.

As members of Parliament are returned to represent the views of their constituents, and as the Indian problem involves issues so vital to the British Empire, it is of the first importance that the electors of this country should have made available to them the fullest information on the subject.

CONTENTS

CHAP	PAGE
I. The Demand for Equality of Status and Self-Determination—Indian National Congress in a Minority	1
II. Statistics : Area—Population—Languages—Castes — Cities — Villages — Railways—Finance and Land Policy—Local Self-Government—British Imports	7
III. Indianisation of the Civil Services : Rapid Progress in Recent Years—Present Proportions of Europeans to Indians in Various Branches	12
IV. Important Dates in Indian History, from 1600 A.D. to 1860 A.D.	15
V. Dates and Summary of Legislation effecting Constitutional Changes in the Government of India, from 1861 to 1930, and of Developments resulting from these Changes	20
VI. Subversive Indian Press	36
VII. An Insidious Type of Publicity	41
VIII. Baseless Allegations by Americans controverted by an American	46
IX. Extracts from Indian National Congress Bulletins	52
X. The Myth of India's Impoverishment by the British	59
XI. Conditions in India at the Commencement of the British Rule, by an Independent Authority	61

CHAP.		PAGE
XII.	Cruel Hindu Customs abolished by the British—Slavery—Suttee—Thuggee—Meriah	65
XIII.	Famine : Dire Effects of Past Visitations—Remedial Measures. Irrigation : Vast Projects inaugurated by the British. Epidemics : Plague and Cholera—Malaria	70
XIV.	Indian Labour—Congress Exploitation for Political Ends	75
XV.	Army and Police : Their Duties and Responsibilities—Army recruited from the Martial Races—Loyalty of both Services despite Continuous Attempts to seduce them	79
XVI.	Indian States—Hostile Congress Propaganda	86
XVII.	Political Unity of India—attained for the first time in its History under British Rule	90
XVIII.	Recent Abortive Peace Negotiations. Congress Leaders reject the Viceroy's Gesture—Futility of negotiating with Intransigents	94
XIX.	National Congress Demands—based on false Premises, and pursued by Illegal Methods	98
XX.	The Fruits of British Rule—a Summary of the Benefits it has brought to India	102
XXI.	A Problem of Perplexity—Cause of the Restive Spirit of the Educated Youth of India	107
XXII.	Summing up	109
	APPENDIX : Some Important Dates in Early Indian History	115

INDIA ON THE BRINK

CHAPTER I

THE DEMAND FOR EQUALITY OF STATUS AND SELF-DETERMINATION

IN the concluding chapter, Vol. I of the Simon Report, the Commission states that :

“the political sentiment which is most widespread among all educated Indians is the expression of a demand for equality with Europeans and a resentment against any suspicion of differential treatment.” (S. R.)

and attributes the rapid acceleration of the movement for independence in recent years to the doctrine of *self-determination* preached during the Great War.

Now the question of equality of status is one which I have discussed with many educated Indians, and they have admitted that, as individuals, socially, they mix on terms of complete equality with Europeans. Their grievance, therefore, would appear not to be personal, but to lie in the fact that the British, who compared to the Indian people are numerically negligible, consider it necessary to reserve the right to decide the time and manner of

the Brahmin (or priest), the Kshatriyas (or warriors), and the Vaishyas (or traders). . . . The one caste that pervades the whole of India is the Brahmin. . . . In Southern India, now nominally Hindu, there is practically no admixture of Aryan blood, the people are of Aboriginal descent and are Hindu by adoption only. . . .

"Amidst the humblest castes of Indian society we may find races that once ruled provinces of their own. . . . Overwhelmed by conquering immigrants . . . for at least twelve centuries by a rigid prohibition of inter-marriage each race has preserved its individuality. A conquered race that does not intermarry with its conquerors remains in isolated subjection; it is *at the bottom of the social scale and remains there*, since it forms no alliances that can raise it in the world. . . . A large proportion of the lower castes are not really Hindu in either religion, customs or sympathies.

"The Brahmin priesthood will have nothing to do with a mass of degraded humanity which has lost all traces of any tribal origin and lives in practical serfdom to the people of the plains—the Chamárs of Northern India, the Mahárs of Bombay, and the Pariahs of Madras—very large communities (Untouchables) which are regarded by the respectable Hindus with the deepest contempt.

"The term which best describes these people is that of Helots; it indicates precisely the contempt in which they are held, *and the origin of this contempt in pride of conquest*. But the most convenient title for them is that which they have earned by working as coolies;—without its coolies India would do badly—*they provide labour for a community which thinks labour degrading*. It may safely be estimated that the classes which are regarded and treated as Helots include at least a quarter of the population. The contempt which this large community endures is of the most surprising character. Coolie families must live in a separate quarter of the village. They are not permitted to draw water from the village well. On the West Coast a coolie meeting a

Brahmin on the road has to step aside some distance into the field lest the air passing him should offend the other's nobility. . . . In the past they have been too much amazed at the indiscriminating tolerance of the British Government, to take full advantage of it . . . but they are gaining in intelligence as well as prosperity. Missionary endeavour has borne good fruit amongst them, and they are aspiring to educate their children and advance in the world. Their ambitions excite in the higher castes irritation and disgust, and a *new chapter of Indian history will begin when these Helots of India gain the self-respect which inspires enthusiasm and the knowledge which can turn it to effect.*" (Sir Bampfylde Fuller, 1910.)

Now the most influential of the Indian National leaders are members of the Brahmin caste, which for centuries past has occupied a position of ascendancy, and which to-day continues to exercise a dominating influence despite the fact that numerically it represents only about 5 per cent. of the population of India. It may be taken for granted that the leaders of the National Congress would not agree to self-determination being left to the representatives of the descendants of the earliest inhabitants of India, viz. the sixty millions of Untouchables—known as the Depressed Classes. The following are the words of Dr. Ambedkar when presiding at Nagpur in August 1930 over the First Session of the All-India Depressed Classes Congress :

"With the aristocracy the notion that a man born a Brahmin cannot be other than a Brahmin, and a man born a Pariah cannot be other than a Pariah, is no idle talk."

Dr. Ambedkar, speaking recently at the Round

Table Conference for the Depressed Classes, said that they

“form a group by themselves which is distinct and separate from the Mohammedans, and although they are included among the Hindus, they in no sense form an integral part of that community—they had welcomed the British as their deliverers from age-long tyranny and repression by the orthodox Hindus—before the British we were in the loathsome condition due to our untouchability.”

I commend consideration of the passages I have quoted above to members of the British Labour party, as I assume they will agree that our first obligation in setting India on the high-road to self-government is to ensure that the Depressed Classes will at last be given the opportunity to rise from the inexpressibly vile conditions to which their class has been relegated for centuries past by the predecessors of the most vocal of the present National leaders. These leaders, if now they gain uncontrolled power, would preserve for centuries to come what Sir Henry Maine described as “the most disastrous and blighting of human institutions.”

LENGTH OF TENURE OF A COUNTRY obviously can have little to do with self-determination, otherwise the North American Indians would not to-day be segregated in reserved areas, nor would white men be governing South Africa. The only alternative appears to be the will of the majority. The population in India at the last Census was 318,942,000. Deducting the following, whose representatives have declared emphatically against severance from the British connection :

Indian States	72,000,000
Mohammedans in British India . .	60,000,000
Untouchables and Aborigines . .	60,000,000
Other minority communities . .	5,000,000
	<hr/>
	197,000,000
	<hr/>

we have left a Hindu population of 121,000,000. According to the Simon Report the politically-minded in India are only a tiny minority, but they may be able to sway masses of men in the countryside, so let us assume for the moment that the whole of these Hindus become supporters of the National Congress party, though actually it is impossible, as *one hundred millions of them are ignorant of and totally indifferent to the issues involved*. They have been told in many places recently that the British Raj had disappeared and therefore they need no longer pay taxes. This attractive information not unnaturally appeals to them until they find it is untrue. Even were the entire Hindu population, excluding the subjects of the Indian States and the Depressed Classes, potential supporters of the National Congress policy, they would still be in a considerable minority. So, if the Brahmin-controlled Congress wishes to impose its will on the 320,000,000 of people in India, it must find some other claim to do so than that *it represents a national insurgence for freedom from British control*.

CHAPTER II

SOME GENERAL STATISTICS OF INTEREST REGARDING INDIA

(1) AREA, 1,805,000 *Square Miles*.

(2) POPULATION, 320 millions, being over 70 per cent. of the population of the British Empire and about one-fifth of the population of the world.

(3) LANGUAGES. There are over two hundred vernaculars, the principal being Urdu, Hindi, Bengali, Rajasthani, Gujerati, Scindi, Marathi, Tamil, Telegu and Kanarese.

(4) CASTES. Hindu society is subdivided into upwards of 2,000 grades called Castes, the lowest grades being the Depressed Classes known as "Untouchables," which represent 25 per cent. of the entire Hindu population.

"It is in many places customary for the Untouchables to be denied access to the wells or tanks used by the other castes, and great difficulty has often been found when a new source of water supply has been provided from public funds by local authorities in arranging for the Untouchables to have use of it. If any village draws its water from a river, the Untouchables will be required to take their supply from a different point, lower down. In many places the children of Untouchables are either excluded altogether from ordinary schools, although

provided in whole or in part from public funds, or else required to sit apart. We have been told of cases in which the Untouchable child attends the lesson standing outside the school. In spite of the eagerness with which *political* India is embracing modern ideas of Government, the ancient social system of Hinduism which has evolved a rigid complication of innumerable castes, from the Brahmin at the top to the Pariah at the bottom, continues to control the lives and thoughts of more than 200 millions out of the 320 millions of the population of India—the equality of Asiatic and European is proclaimed, while the clash of Brahmin and non-Brahmin or caste and outcast is intensified—ultra-democratic constitutions are propounded, although the long process which was a necessary antecedent to democracy in Europe, viz. the breaking down of class and communal and occupational barriers, has only just begun. Indian thought finds it tempting to foreshorten history and is unwilling to wait for the final stage of a prolonged evolution. It is impatient of the doctrine of gradualness.” (S. R.)

“Within India caste breaks up Society into thousands of separate units, frequently hostile one to the other and always jealous. The institution necessarily tends to hinder active hearty co-operation for any purpose, religious, political or social; all reformers are conscious of the difficulties thus placed in their paths . . . each individual finds his personal liberty of action checked in hundreds of ways unknown to the dwellers in other lands . . . the restrictions of caste rules collide continually with the conditions of modern life and are the source of endless inconveniences. The institution is a relic of the ancient past and does not readily adapt itself to the requirements of the twentieth century . . . the institution fosters intense class pride, fatal to a feeling of brotherhood between man and man.” (*Oxford History of India.*)

“These Pariahs are the born slaves of India; it never occurs to the Pariah to think that his fate is anything but irrevocable. The contempt and aversion with which

the other castes, and particularly the Brahmins, regard these unfortunate people are carried to such an excess that in many places their presence and even their foot-prints are considered sufficient to defile the whole neighbourhood." (Abbe Dubois, 1806.)

"Even to this day a Pariah is not allowed to pass a Brahmin street in a village." (Beauchamp, 1906.)

(5) CITIES. Calcutta and Bombay are the only Indian cities with a population exceeding one million, and in the whole of India only thirty-three cities have a population of over 100,000.

(6) VILLAGES. There are over 500,000 villages in India;

"226 millions out of 244 millions of people in British India live a rural life, and the proportion of those who ever give a thought to matters beyond the horizon of their villages is very small. Agriculture is the one great occupation of the people." (M. C.)

"The degree of success in working democratic institutions in the modern State and the pace at which an advance towards complete self-government can be made must necessarily be conditioned by the capacity of the mass of the people to understand the problems of a great Society and to take its part in dealing with them." (S. R.)

(7) RAILWAYS.

"The State Railways system of India consists of over 40,000 miles of railway, and the total capital outlay is more than £600,000,000. The administrative control of this huge organisation, one of the biggest in the world, is centralised under a board of four members appointed by the Government. There is a definite annual contribution from the railways to the general revenue of the country of one per cent. of the capital outlay, and this is a first

charge on the net receipts of the railway; in addition to this, a proportion, generally one-fifth of the net surplus profits, is credited to general revenues and the remainder transferred to the Railway Reserve Fund." (S. R.)

(8) FINANCE AND LAND POLICY.

"Indian finance always has depended on the land policy, because *from time immemorial* the right of the Government, whatever its form might be, to a large share of the gross produce of the land has been admitted by everybody, and that share has been the principal source of the income of the State . . . even now . . . the Land Revenue constitutes about 30 to 40 per cent. of the income of the Government of India. *In earlier days its percentage was considerably higher*, amounting to 75 per cent. or more of the gross receipts; theoretical limitations did not count for much—in practice *nearly every ruler, Hindu or Mussulman, took all he could get*, and often the principle was avowed that the cultivating occupier (the ryot) should be left no more than a bare subsistence and seed grain in order that he might not wax fat and kick. Very often so much was not left; then the *cultivators were forced to desert their lands*, which lay waste a prey to wild beasts. . . . The financial and economic benefits of moderate assessment are now universally recognised in British India, but the practical difficulties of attaining the golden mean are immense." (*Oxford History of India.*)

(9) LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT, instituted by the British, has endowed

"Every town in India, even to places of 5,000 inhabitants, with a municipal board, and has divided up the country into rural areas, each of which in local matters is administered by a board of similar character. Admission to these boards goes very largely by election." (Sir Bampfylde Fuller, 1910.)

INDIA ON THE BRINK

(10) BRITISH IMPORTS INTO INDIA.

Sir Geoffrey Corbett, speaking for the Government of India at the Round Table Conference, said :

"In 1928-29, the last year for which I have comparative figures, our imports from the other countries of the Empire amounted to £109,000,000 sterling, or 40 per cent. more than Australia's Empire imports. Our imports from Great Britain alone amounted to £90,000,000 sterling, almost equalling the total imports from Great Britain, of Canada, South Africa and New Zealand put together, yet our population is so large that our Empire purchases are equivalent to less than $\frac{1}{4}$ d. per head per day. I leave you to calculate the possibilities of expansion."

CHAPTER III

INDIANISATION OF THE CIVIL SERVICES

IN 1910 Sir Bampfylde Fuller wrote :

“ Within the last few years very substantial concessions have been made to Indian sentiment—the increase in the number and authority of non-officials on the Legislative Councils, the appointment of Indians to high office on the Councils of the Viceroy, of the Governor of Bombay and Madras, and of the Secretary of State and in the Privy Council, redeem very substantially the promises made in Queen Victoria’s proclamation.”

No one who has been in close touch with India for the last twenty years can fail to have been impressed with the immense progress that has been made during this period in the Indianisation of the public services, and there can be no doubt that if in 1920 Mr. Gandhi and his National Congress colleagues had given and had continued to give their whole-hearted support to the new Constitution which was then inaugurated, instead of doing everything in their power to wreck it, Indianisation of the services by to-day would have been even further advanced.

As Mr. Srinivasa Sastri recently said at the Round Table Conference :

“ A vast army of Indian officials were working alongside the few thousand English officials.”

The following figures give some indication of the proportion in which Europeans form part of the Indian services as a whole :

“ In the Department known as General Administration, which comprises the Commissioners of Divisions, the District officers and their subordinates, there are in round figures 630 Europeans out of a total of 5,500 if the lower classes of subordinates are excluded. We have not been able to ascertain the total number of lower subordinates, such as village officers in British India, but in the United Provinces alone they amount to about 28,500.” (S. R.)

As the population of the United Provinces is about 48 millions, it would be reasonable to assume that under the General Administration Department the personnel of the lower classes of Indian subordinate Government officials in the whole of British India numbers approximately 150,000.

In other Departments the proportions are as follows :

“ *Police Services.* 600 European officers and nearly 800 European police sergeants, out of a total of approximately 187,000.

“ *Civil Medical Departments.* 200 Europeans in a total of nearly 6,000 fully or partly qualified medical men.

“ *Education Services.* 200 Europeans out of a total of about 1,500 officers in the higher grades. The subordinate services (which also include men of higher education, mainly graduates of Indian Universities) add 11,000 more to the total.

“ *Forest Services.* 240 Europeans in a total of 16,000.

“ *Engineering Department.* 500 Europeans in a total of 7,500.

“State Railways. The higher staff consist of about 1,500 Europeans and 700 Indians: the Intermediate grades contain 2,000 Europeans out of 9,000. The total number of employees on these railways is over 800,000.

“Judiciary. From the High Courts down to the lowest grade of Judges there are 230 Europeans out of 2,500.

“These figures show how small relatively are the numbers of Europeans in Government employ. . . .

“It will be realised, however, that they are, broadly speaking, employed at the top.—It must be remembered that by adopting the higher rates of Indian recruitment introduced after the Lee Commission, the preponderance of Europeans in these higher ranks is constantly being reduced and will disappear.” (S. R.)

When discussing recently with some Congress supporters their demands for independence, I asked them how they thought the machinery of Government would function if suddenly British control ceased and British guidance was no longer available. They airily replied that it would make practically no difference, as 95 per cent. of those at present running the Government machine were Indians; therefore, already they possessed the requisite experience.

I then asked them, if that be the case, how could they possibly justify the present lawless agitation? To this question they could give no satisfactory reply.

CHAPTER IV

IMPORTANT DATES IN INDIAN HISTORY

FROM 1600 A.D. TO 1860 A.D.

supplemented with quotations from V. A. Smith's
Oxford History of India

THERE will be found in the Appendix the dates and a brief compendium of outstanding eras in Indian history from 322 B.C. to the advent of the British in India.

In this chapter are recorded the dates of important episodes during the British régime, from the granting of the East India Company's Charter, to the suppression of the Indian Mutiny in the year 1858 A.D.

A.D.

1600. FIRST CHARTER OF THE EAST INDIA COMPANY, granted by Queen Elizabeth.

1612. The English established a Trading Station at Surat.

1620-25. The English established a Trading Station in Bengal.

1639. The site of the present city of Madras was granted to an Englishman, Mr. Day. This was England's first proprietary holding in India.

- A.D. Bombay was ceded to the English by the Portuguese.
1661. Portuguese.
1690. Calcutta was founded by an Englishman named Job Charnock of the East India Company.
1756. The Black Hole of Calcutta tragedy.
1757. The Battle of Plassey fought by Lord Clive, whose victory "decided the fate of Bengal, and in a sense of all India."
1773. Parliament passed the "Regulating Act," which created a new form of Government for India and definitely subjected the East India Company to the control of the Crown.
- "The enactment of this Act may be regarded as the starting-point of the modern constitutional history of India."
1799. The storming of Seringapatam, ending in the final defeat and death of Tippoo Sultan.
1818. The end of the Maratha war, which resulted in the extension of British paramountcy throughout India.
1833. "By the Charter Act of 1833, the Governor-General of Bengal became the Governor-General of India; his Government was known for the first time as the Government of India." (S. R.)
1857. THE INDIAN MUTINY. The Mutiny is generally attributed to false rumours, that spread throughout the country with lightning rapidity, by means of cryptic messages. First, the widespread apprehension (absolutely

A.D. 1857. unfounded) that people were forcibly to be made Christians; second, "An ill-considered regulation directed the Sepoys to bite the ends off cartridges," and

"in January 1858, reports were made that the Sepoys believed the cartridges to be greased with cows' and pigs' fat for the express purpose of destroying their caste and making them Christians. The regulation was rescinded; directions were given that the greased cartridges should not be issued, and assurances were freely promulgated, but it was all of no use, and the men would not believe the assurances of their officers or the Government.

"On March 29th at Barrackpore the Adjutant of the 34th N.I. was cut down on the parade ground by a Brahmin Sepoy, his comrades looking on without stirring, except one—a Mohammedan—who gallantly rushed to defend his officer."

The necessary disciplinary action was taken, but

"the growing excitement amongst the Sepoys was marked by numerous incendiary fires at Barrackpore. . . . Twenty-five similar fires occurred at distant Umballa. 'At Meerut the men of the 3rd Cavalry refused the cartridges, and on May 3rd the 7th Oudh Infantry mutinied at Lucknow.' . . . Sentences on 85 of the Cavalry mutineers 'were promulgated at a special parade on May 9th.' The 'next day, Sunday, while evening service was being held, the Cavalry and two Infantry regiments broke open the jail, released their comrades, burnt the officers' houses, murdered every European on whom they could

c

lay hands, and hurried off to Delhi,' where they were quickly joined by other regiments and by all the disorderly elements. . . . They 'proclaimed the restoration of the Mogul Empire and placed the aged titular Emperor Bahadur Shah on his throne."

"All Europeans whom the rebels could find, men, women, and children, were ruthlessly massacred";—the disorders spread rapidly over the Agra Province, which soon became a sea of anarchy. "Murder, burning and pillage raged unchecked in every district"; Cawnpore witnessed "one of the most atrocious crimes on record." After holding heroically for three weeks a station utterly unprepared for defence, a capitulation was arranged, the Nana Sahib, who resided near Cawnpore and always professed friendship with the British, having promised to convey the gallant garrison to Allahabad. Instead he massacred them at the riverside, where boats had been collected on pretence of conveying them to safety.

"About 200 women and children were confined in a small building . . . and hacked to death on the night of July 15th by express orders of the Nana and his colleague, Tantia Topi,"

their bodies being cast into a well close to the house of slaughter.

"The relieving forces under Havelock entered Cawnpore just too late," and "the justly infuriated troops took terrible vengeance."

The recapture of Delhi on September 14th, 1858, was the turning-point of the Mutiny, and

“from that date the ultimate success of the British Government was no longer in doubt, and *the waverers who had held back while the issue was doubtful hastened to render aid to the Government.*”

“Much hard fighting had to be done and much suffering endured before peace and order were finally restored late in 1859. . . . The Sepoys, and even the Nana, who should have known better, were silly enough to imagine that they could destroy the British Empire in India by massacring all Europeans or Christians within their reach; they wholly failed to understand the latent strength of a great European nation, holding command of the sea, and in their ignorance rushed blindly upon destruction.” (*Oxford History of India.*)

“The Mutiny swept the Indian sky clear of many clouds—it taught India and the world that the English possessed the courage and national spirit which made light of disaster, which never counted whether the odds against them were two or ten to one, and which marched confident to victory although the conditions of success appeared almost hopeless.” (Sir Lepel Griffin.)

A.D. 1858. Parliament passed “an Act for the better Government of India,” and on November 1st the transfer of the Government of India from the East India Company to the Crown was proclaimed throughout India.

CHAPTER V

DATES AND SUMMARY OF LEGISLATION EFFECTING CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA, FROM 1861 TO 1930, AND OF DEVELOP- MENTS RESULTING FROM THESE CHANGES

A.D.

1861. "The Legislative Council was reconstituted by the Indian Councils Act of 1861. The number of 'additional' members was increased from 6 to 12, and half of these were to be non-officials. Some of these new seats were given to Indians, and it is *therefore from 1861 that an Indian element has taken part in the making of laws for India.*" (S. R.)
1876. The Royal Titles Act was passed proclaiming Her Majesty Queen Victoria, Empress of India.
1892. *The Indian Councils Act of 1892*
"made a limited and indirect provision for the use of the method of election in filling up some of the non-official seats, both in the Provincial Councils and on the Indian Legislative Council."
(S. R.)
1909. *Morley-Minto Reforms.*
"The constitutional changes effected under authority of the Indian Councils Act of 1909

included an increase in the number of members of the Madras and Bombay Executive Councils, and provided for the establishment of similar Councils in other provinces. The Legislative Councils were considerably enlarged and they were granted power to pass resolutions on the Budget or any other matter of general public interest. The principle of election to these Councils was specifically recognised, though the power of nomination was retained to a certain extent. In Bengal the majority of the whole body was elected." (S. R.)

"The regulations issued under the Act created non-official majorities in all the provincial Legislative Councils while maintaining an official majority in that of the Governor-General. As a sequel to the Act, an Indian was appointed to the Supreme Executive Council, and similar appointments have since been made in the provincial Executive Councils. Lord Morley had already placed two natives of India upon the Council of the Secretary of State." (*Oxford History of India.*)

A.D.

1918. *Montagu-Chelmsford Report.* In 1917, Mr. Montagu, Secretary of State for India, and Lord Chelmsford, the Viceroy, were charged

"with the duty of devising substantial steps in the direction of the gradual development of self-governing institutions in India." (S. R.)

They wrote :

"The process will begin in local affairs. The time has come for advance also in some subjects of provincial concern, and it will proceed to the complete control of provincial matters, and thence

in course of time, and subject to the proper discharge of Imperial responsibilities, to the control of matters concerning all India. We make it plain that such limitations of power as we are now proposing are due only to the obvious fact that time is necessary in order to train both representatives and electorates for the work which we desire them to undertake, and that we are offering Indians opportunities at short intervals to make good their claim—not by method of agitation but by positive demonstration—to the further stages in self-government which we have just indicated.” (M. C.)

A.D.

1919. The Indian Reforms Bill was passed by Parliament, and

“in most respects the scheme of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report was translated into law.” (S. R.)

Devolution to the Provinces was carried out by rules made under the Act, in the nine major Provinces, viz. Madras, Bombay, Bengal, the United Provinces, Punjab, Bihar and Orissa, the Central Provinces, Assam and Burma. Control was retained by the Central Government of Military matters, Foreign Affairs, Tariffs and Customs, Railways, Posts and Telegraphs, Income Tax, Currency, Coinage and the Public Debt, Commerce and Shipping, and Civil and Criminal Law, all of these being subjects affecting the whole of British India, and therefore necessitating unity of control. Among the subjects that passed under the

control of the Provincial Governments were Local Self-Government, Medical Administration and Public Health, Education (with certain exceptions), Public Works and Irrigation, Land Revenue Administration, Famine Relief, Agriculture, Forests, and Law and Order, with certain reservations.

Provincial subjects were to be administered under a system described as "dyarchy." The subjects classed as "provincial" were subdivided into "transferred and reserved subjects." Transferred subjects are dealt with by the Governor and his Ministers chosen from the elected members of the Provincial Legislative Council.

"This brought to an end the 'one man' Government which down to 1921 existed in five provinces." (S. R.)

RESERVED SUBJECTS. Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford felt that

"the setting up of Provincial Legislatures with a majority of members for the first time chosen by an inexperienced and largely illiterate electorate, could not be at once combined with the handing over of all provincial departments—including the Police, the Magistracy, and the Revenue—to Ministers whose administrative experience was necessarily small and whose responsibility would be solely to newly-created Legislatures and to newly-enfranchised constituents." (M. C.)

Therefore certain subjects, including Police,

Prisons and Reformatories, Administration of Justice, settlement of labour disputes, control of newspapers, borrowing money on the credit of the Province, land revenue administration, were retained under the control of the Governor in Council. Members of Council are appointed by His Majesty, and in practice half of them have been

A.D. Indians.

1920. The new Constitution was inaugurated at Delhi by H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught; concurrently Mr. Gandhi, supported by the Indian National Congress, launched his first "non-violent" civil disobedience and non-co-operation campaign.

"Local detachments of Congress National volunteers devoted themselves to the movement, and the influences they brought to bear to secure non-co-operation with Government were often quite inconsistent with the tenets of 'non-violence.' The masses in India are normally law-abiding, but the inevitable result of widespread vilification of the administration directed by a man of Mr. Gandhi's influence and reputation was contempt for the law."

"By the beginning of 1921 disorder had broken out in many provinces. In Malabar, in the growing belief that Government could no longer enforce its powers, the 'Moplahs' arose in rebellion, and having destroyed the machinery of government in their area and killed or driven off all the officials, they turned on the Hindu population in an outburst of murder, arson, and outrage. . . . There were few who did not read the lessons

of the outbreak, but Mr. Gandhi and the Congress leaders were among them. They made plans for organised civil disobedience in every province, and the intensity of the anti-government feeling steadily grew. In Bombay, on the day the Prince of Wales landed in India, a conflict occurred between the loyal and the non-co-operating elements; in the ensuing riot 53 persons were killed and 403 wounded. . . . Twenty-one police constables were murdered with revolting cruelty at Chauri Chaura in the United Provinces by a mob acting under the excitement of the anti-government movement." (S. R.)

A.D.

1922. In March 1922 Mr. Gandhi was arrested, and for the time being the movement subsided. But while the movement was at its height,

"defiance of authority became widespread, an extraordinary development in Indian districts where the power of Government had never been questioned within living memory. Police stations were attacked and Europeans were assaulted, and every kind of intimidation and social pressure was employed to induce the general body of officials to resign. The effect on the morale of the rank and file of the police was serious . . . the whole position turned on their loyalty, and to lose the protection of the law which they maintained, brought them almost to the breaking point. In this case it was only the influence of the higher officials of the force that prevented them from resigning in a body." (S. R.)

1923. Marked the commencement of communal riots between Hindus and Mohammedans. As

"to many of them it seemed that there was a possibility of political control passing before long completely out of the hands of Parliament, it became important for each community to organise and consolidate its forces in preparation for the new situation that would then arise." (S. R.)

The true cause of the existing Hindu-Moslem tension

"is the struggle for political power and for the opportunity which political power confers. So long as authority was firmly established in British hands and self-government was not thought of, there was little for members of one community to fear from the predominance of the other. The comparative absence of communal strife in the Indian States may be similarly explained. . . . The coming of the reforms and the anticipation of what may follow them has given new point to Hindu-Moslem competition. By the middle of 1923 communal riots marked by murder, arson and looting were of almost monthly occurrence." (S. R.)

A.D.

1924. In 1924 fierce outbursts occurred in many of the greater cities.
1925. "Saw a lull in actual rioting, but the tone of the Press and of public speeches left no doubt about the intensity of communal feeling." (S. R.)
1926. "In April there occurred the first of a series of dangerous riots in Calcutta, and the following twelve months saw 40 riots resulting in the death of 197 persons and injuries to 1600. . . . By this time it had become clear to everyone that it was no longer a question of isolated clashes of merely

local concern. . . . What was at issue was the All-India problem of the political relations of the two major communities. . . . Communal representation in the legislatures and the Government services and in local bodies became the all-important question. Conferences of leaders, not only of the two communities, but of all parties, were held to find ways of securing peace, for it was recognised that communal antagonism stood in the way of general political advance, but such attempts failed in face of the determination of each community to secure its political future." (S. R.)

A.D.

1927. Lord Irwin, speaking at the opening of the Simla Session of the Indian Legislature on the 29th August, 1927, said :

" I am not exaggerating when I say that during the seventeen months that I have been in India the whole landscape has been overshadowed by the lowering clouds of communal tension which have repeatedly discharged their thunderbolts, spreading far throughout the land their devastating havoc. From April to July last year Calcutta seemed to be under the mastery of some evil spirit which so gripped the minds of men that, in their insanity, they held themselves absolved from the most sacred restraints of human conduct. Since then we have seen the same sinister influences at work in Panba, Rawalpindi, Lahore and many other places, and have been forced to look upon that abyss of unchained human passions that lies too often beneath the surface of habit and of law. In less than eighteen months, so far as numbers are available, the toll taken by this bloody strife has been between 250 and 300 killed and injured."

The Indian Statutory Commission which was appointed by Royal Warrant on the 27th September, 1927, paid its first visit to India in February 1928.

A.D. 1928. The Commission again visited India in October 1928, and on this occasion remained in the country for six months.

1929. In 1929 serious communal riots occurred in various parts of India, and in February of that year, Bombay for a brief period was a city of carnage, and daily, cold-blooded murders were perpetrated in broad daylight. One Sunday, about 1 p.m., within sight of the central police station, ten people were stabbed in a tramcar, several of whom died. The daily toll of murder rose and the main streets of the bazaar were littered with refuse from looted shops. Thousands of Indians fled in terror from the city and large numbers of clerks in commercial firms were afraid to leave their homes. Business was paralysed, and the situation was so ominous that a deputation of citizens, including several *leading members of the Indian National Congress Party*, *petitioned the Governor to utilise the military to restore order*, as the police unaided were becoming powerless. The Warwickshire and Cheshire Regiments were brought on the scene and posted in pickets throughout the city. Curfew was proclaimed, honorary magistrates sworn in, and in a few days complete quiet was restored and conditions became normal.

Government was then compelled to take action, otherwise, as the *Times of India* stated in a leading article, the country would soon "be drifting into a state of bloody chaos."

Congress leaders were arrested, their places being filled immediately by others. The Congress working Committee under successive Presidents, including Pandit Motilal Nehru and Mr. Vallabhai Patel, passed resolution on resolution inciting the army and the police to mutiny, and directing provincial organisations to conduct a campaign for the non-payment of Government taxes.

In a speech by Mr. Gandhi before his arrest he urged his listeners to break the law by making salt, and to resist police attempts to take salt from their hands until blood is spilt. To surround illicit salt pans and to

"defend that treasure with your life if that be the price you have to pay for it. When police come to raid these pans, surround them and do not let the police touch them until they have overpowered you by sheer brute force."

Surely no reasonable person can regard this exhortation as otherwise than highly inflammatory. The results unfortunately are already on record, as throughout the country the representatives of law and order have since been contending with continuous outbursts of lawlessness and violence.

"Never has there been a troublesome semi-revolutionary movement carried on for such slender reasons,

nor have economic interests been made to suffer with less justification." (Ramsay MacDonald.)

In a leading article in August last, headed "Terrorism," the *Statesman* wrote as follows :

"We are rapidly getting face to face with stark realities. . . . When we have four murderous outrages aimed at the Bengal police in five days we cannot forget the recent campaign of vilification, for which not only Congress men but alleged Moderates are responsible. In the Provincial Council and in the Assembly the Bengal police have been singled out for a ruthless and reckless attack. In the Assembly the member who procured a debate upon the Dacca riots sought to draw a red herring across the trail of communalism by concentrating all his venom upon the guardians of the peace. A more unworthy speech could not have been delivered, and we leave its author to his conscience in view of what has subsequently happened. Mr. Gandhi, too, must be left to his conscience. Within the last year he has publicly declared that he saw no signs that the country was educated up to the point of understanding his doctrine of non-violent civil disobedience. Nevertheless, he launched his campaign, knowing on his own confession that it would eventually lead to the same abominable deeds as marked its trail ten years ago. Can the apologists for the Congress persuade themselves that they have no responsibility for the horrors of Peshawar, Chittagong, Sholapur, and these last outrages ! . . . The Congress has proclaimed a revolution, and a kid-glove revolution over a prolonged period is not yet in human nature. At New Year (1st January, 1930) the India National Congress as a constitutional body committed suicide. In its place we have an avowedly revolutionary organisation at war with the Crown. For some time the fact appeared to escape the notice of the authorities, but crime has drawn attention to it."

In another chapter I give extracts from the Bombay Provincial Congress Bulletin, a cyclostyled leaflet published daily in Bombay under the authority of the Congress. Editors of the leaflet are arrested as soon as the police can secure them, but others immediately replace them.

They are practically all misguided, hot-headed youths, usually about twenty years of age, though occasionally a young woman fills the gap. Their allegations are so wildly preposterous that no intelligent person would give them one second's credence.

Unfortunately however, the leaflets are circulated in tens of thousands amongst the ignorant multitude, and in such quarters they do infinite harm.

For the moment I quote only one passage from *Revolution*, another cyclostyled Bombay publication.

“Shakespeare has said, A life for a life, an eye for an eye, but this Satanic Government takes two lives for one. Remember Dhansheti, Sharda, Shinde and Kurban Hussein, the Sholapur *martyrs*, and vow that henceforth you will also take two English lives for one Indian. Let your claws and beaks be sharpened so as to tear into pieces every Englishman that means to raise his head against a single countryman of yours. ‘Hands off India,’ should be your cry.”

N.B.—The Sholapur *martyrs* above referred to were sentenced for the dastardly murder of Indian policemen. The supposed ‘quotation’ from Shakespeare indicates the degree of education and the calibre of the misguided youths responsible for these pernicious diatribes.

The following quotation from an article by

INDIA ON THE BRINK

"Satiricus" in the *Times of India* describing the form of Congress "non-violent" activity:

"Every day we have a spectacle of Congress keeping the fires of agitation alive with the fuel as distinct from a mere sense of discontent and. If Mr. Gandhi had agitated in the same manner as Russia, which a large section of the Congress bound much semi-officially, he would have been shot or at least exiled in one of those waste stretches of bound lands which help to swell Russia on the Blind, unthinking hatred is inculcated in the very the same principle is actually acted on by the itself in its crusade of iconoclastic atheism; this is being exploited at the moment in India, the general of the future are being bred in an atmosphere of hate the Prabhat Feri songs, some of which actually extend to violence, ask the people how long they are going to submit meekly. Certain branches of Congress activity are anything but non-violent. The breaking of forest laws by men cutting down and mutilating trees is one instance. The cutting of toddy trees, which are often private property, is perhaps still more revolting. Imagine yourself in a rural district, living on your estate, miles away from anywhere and so from help. Late one night you wake up and find a gang of about fifty villagers, armed with axes, hatchets and ropes, cutting down your palm trees, which possibly have been handed down in your family. You protest—you plead. 'No,' they say, 'We'll cut down your trees.' You say you are willing to give an undertaking not to sell toddy for two or three years, but ask if your trees may be saved, since they take generations to grow. The work of destruction goes on regardless of your efforts, then you say, 'As you have mutilated my trees, at least pull them up root and branch, that I may till the soil and earn my bread.' 'No,' they say, 'You can do that for yourself,' and they walk away. This is not an imaginary event. Such cases have actually happened in plenty. Is this non-violence?"

Quite apart from the ethics of enforced temperance, can it by any stretch of imagination be said that cutting down a man's trees which are the source of his livelihood, in his presence, and in spite of his protests, is a passive and peaceful occupation?" ("Satiricus.")

Even when the Sapru-Jayakar peace negotiations were in progress, Congress continued to extend the field of its lawless activities, and at the time the *Evening News*, Bombay, rightly wrote :

"So long as the defiance of constituted authority is encouraged by the Congress, so long as people are incited to break the laws of the land and withhold the payment of taxes levied by the State, so long as the liberty of the individual to pursue his legitimate vocation and buy and sell what he pleases is interfered with, so long as the persecution of people who are not willing to subordinate their own judgment to that of the Congress for political purposes, so long as Congress goes on reaffirming resolutions inciting the military and the police to mutiny—so long as all these things are done under the guise of a non-violent creed, an agreement is impossible."

On the 27th December, 1930, Lord Irwin, addressing the European Association of Calcutta, spoke as follows :

"The fact that civil disobedience claims to rest on the harmless gospel of negation has not prevented its rapid development into a challenge to constituted government and a grave menace to order. *Those who have summoned from the deep this spirit of law-breaking in support of a so-called non-violent movement do not escape responsibility when their gospel leads ill-balanced minds to resort to the methods of violent terrorism of which you have had experience. . . .* If repression means a determination to resist the menace of civil disobedience, the Government will readily plead guilty to the charge, for no Government

worthy of the name could do otherwise ; but if by repression our critics mean that the Government desires by any action it has been forced to take, to strangle national aspirations or obstruct India's constitutional advance, then I say no such charge can be levelled against those who are responsible for commenting on the Simon Report as we did in the Reforms Despatch of the Government of India published a few weeks ago. In that despatch we recorded our view that in the future relationship between Great Britain and India the time has come for the relation of partnership to supersede that of subordination. I have seen it said in many quarters, that proposals made by the Government of India do not translate this view into practical reality. That criticism I believe is based on an imperfect appreciation of the manner in which such arrangements as we foreshadow might with the goodwill of both sides be expected to operate."

CHAPTER VI

SUBVERSIVE INDIAN PRESS

UNREST in India has been fermented to a disastrous extent by extremist Indian journals which issue a steady flow of false and inflammatory propaganda and abuse the licence they enjoy to an extent that no other governing Power than the British would tolerate. This is not a recent development.

“The first Indian newspaper printed in English was the *Bengal Gazette*, which began its stormy course in January 1780 and was suppressed early in 1782.” (*Oxford History of India*.)

In 1857 Lord Canning, addressing his Legislative Council, said :

“I doubt whether it is fully understood or known to what an audacious extent sedition has been poured into the hearts of the native population of India within the last few weeks in addition to perversion of facts. There are constant vilifications of the Government, false rumours of its purposes and increasing attempts to sow discontent and hatred between it and its subjects.”

In 1878, after the Russo-Turkish war :

“the successes of Russia had excited the minor journalists in India and led to the publication in vernacular newspapers of many seditious articles extolling Russia, depreciating England, suggesting the assassination of

British officers and advocating combination for the purpose of overthrowing the British Raj." (*Oxford History of India.*)

This caused the " Vernacular Press Act " to be passed, but it was repealed in 1882.

In 1905, Japan's victory over Russia had a similar effect.

" The outbreak of atrocious political crime which marked Lord Minto's term of office . . . undoubtedly was stimulated by the meditation of discontented young men upon the Japanese success . . . local grievances arising from Indian administrative measures became merged in a dangerous revolutionary and anarchist conspiracy directed in India from *Bengal and Poona, and supported by foreign organisations in Europe and America.* Constant incitement to crime having been offered in many newspapers, restrictions on the licence of the Press and other emergency measures were necessarily enacted. Many Bengali and other officers, who displayed the highest courage in the execution of their duties, sacrificed their lives in the cause of social order and in the service of their Sovereign Lord the King." (*Oxford History of India.*)

Speaking in the Legislative Council in February 1910, Sir Herbert Risley said :

" We are at the present moment confronted with a murderous conspiracy whose aim is to subvert the Government of the country and to make British rule impossible by establishing general terrorism. Their organisation is effective and far-reaching and their numbers are believed to be considerable. The leaders work in secret and are blindly obeyed by youthful followers. The method they favour at present is political assassination—(here follows a list of murders and

attempted murders)—*these things are the natural and necessary consequence of the teaching of certain journals.* They have prepared the soil in which anarchy flourishes. This is no mere general statement: the chain of causation is clear—not only does the campaign of violence date from the change in the tone of the Press, but specific outbursts of incitement have been followed by specific outrages.”

In 1910 Sir Bampfylde Fuller wrote :

“The spirit of the Indian Press has passed through two phases. Until recent years the editor's object has been mainly commercial—to sell his newspaper; lately it has become very largely propagandist—to breed discontent with British rule. Of recent years no calumny of our actions has been too outrageous for publication. To the intelligent we have been described as draining the country of its resources, as stifling its development, degrading its arts and emasculating its spirit. For old-fashioned readers we are attempting to destroy caste and to pervert Hindus from their religion. To the ignorant we are actually shown as poisoning the wells to spread plague. The sentimental—and sentiment pervades the East—are stirred by pathetic references to the India of epic time, which in deep distress, but with undying spirit, lies bound at the feet of a nation of shopkeepers. To rescue her no act is immoral; and many editors in parables, and not a few in open language, have been exhorting the youth of the country to assassinate Europeans. The high priests of this hostility are the Brahmins of the West Coast, who cannot forget that only a century has passed since they were the moving spirit of the Maratha Confederacy. It was first openly displayed by them thirty years ago in the publication of newspapers which opposed the Government with a seditious virulence that was elsewhere unknown. People noted with amazement that these attacks were not suppressed.”
(Sir Bampfylde Fuller, K.C.S.I., 1910.)

Although India contains three hundred millions of illiterates, vernacular papers

“are read to illiterate hearers by their literate fellows in towns, villages, railway carriages, public meetings and so on.

“The effective circulation of many vernacular papers is therefore far greater than the mere figures of sales suggest.

“A broad view of the Indian-owned and edited Press shows . . . in many newspapers a freedom indeed, a violence of language which from time to time brings within the scope of the criminal law the person put forward as editor.

“A feature of the writings in the vernacular Press during the past few years has been the volume and bitterness of inter-communal polemics.

“The bulk of Indian-owned newspapers, whether in English or the vernacular, stand for various degrees of Nationalist opposition, varying from insistent demands for further reforms for India to full-blooded advocacy of complete independence of the British connection.

“One of the first-fruits of the reforms of 1919 was the repeal of the Press Act of 1910—the Indian Press has taken full advantage of the repeal—some newspapers indeed have exhibited a licence to which it would be difficult to find a parallel. . . . When the Government is attacked there is no one to defend it and the most extravagant invention at its expense seems often to go unchallenged.

“It is difficult to convey how serious is the handicap to Government created by the absence of any effective exposition in the Indian-owned Press of the reasons for action taken and the facts on which it is based—the most exaggerated rumour finds its way into a certain class of Indian newspaper—the interests of good government are undermined and confidence in the administration is shaken by the distortion and misrepresentation practised with impunity by certain Indian newspapers and by the absence of adequate means of counteracting it.

"Not only has the Government of India 'no Press,' but it has 'no platform.' Except for an occasional address by the Viceroy or by a Governor, and except for speeches made by officials in the legislatures, political advocacy is left to critics—the Government case goes by default. It is obvious that this constitutes a very grave danger . . . to the general respect in which organised authority ought to be held. The danger is all the greater because India is a place where hearsay, however improbable, seems to gain widespread credence and to be capable of arousing fierce passion." (S. R.)

There can be no doubt whatever that in its anxiety not to interfere with the liberty of the Press, Government has for far too long refrained from action against journals from which there has flowed a continuous stream of subversive and revolutionary propaganda—propaganda based on the grossest and most wicked misrepresentation of facts which for lack of refutation has spread like a virulent poison amongst millions of simple folk who believe it to be true.

"The most violent and mendacious statements are made with the knowledge that there will be little attempt to rebut them; hard-working and devoted officials, Indian as well as British, have the feeling that they will not be defended . . . methods must be found to spread truthful information more widely. The need for a *fair* presentation of facts and policy is not confined to India. The misleading effect on public opinion *throughout the world* is no less important to be kept in mind. . . . We must put on record our strong conviction that unless a corrective is forthcoming the orderly development of Indian institutions is put in jeopardy. The plant of self-government cannot be expected to exhibit a healthy growth in an atmosphere so poisoned by misrepresentation." (S. R.)

CHAPTER VII

AN INSIDIOUS TYPE OF PUBLICITY

THERE has been permitted by Government a type of publicity which, though less extreme than that described in the previous chapters, is possibly more insidious, and which I know from personal observation has been just as baneful in its effects, especially among that considerable body of Indians who, although literate, never hitherto have taken any interest in political questions, being content to "pursue day by day their avocations under the benevolence of a settled and ordered Government."

This important section of Indian opinion undoubtedly in recent months has been drifting steadily into the Congress camp; this especially has been the case in Bombay—the reason being the growing belief that a weak Government was tottering under the Congress attack, and the waverers not unnaturally desire to be on the winning side. When daily articles appeared in an Indian-owned Bombay Journal, penned by an Englishman, reinforcing this belief by irresponsible attacks on the Government and Government officials from the Viceroy downwards, many of the hitherto neutrals, including Parsis—that small but relatively pros-

even Sir John Simon could ever learn. He posed as a pale reflection of the Almighty, and with his six mediocrities he wandered about the country, going from Province to Province, becoming more conceited, more obtuse, as national opposition unveiled itself before him. Sir John Simon has misled his country, and the representatives of vested interests have followed suit, with alacrity. . . . Indian Nationalism has come to stay, and the mere fact that it has been duped and deluded by its opponents is merely making it harden its heart for the struggle that is to come if there is no adjustment."

The offensive comments above quoted were directed against one who was discharging with infinite courage and patience, and at immense personal sacrifice, a task of immeasurable difficulty, and to whom Mr. Lloyd George recently referred as "the greatest jurist in the British Empire and one of the greatest statesmen in the British Empire," and of whose labours and those of his colleagues, the Prime Minister, in his closing speech at the Round Table Conference, said, they had "done a work remarkable, conspicuous and essential." "India will never be able to show too great a gratitude for the labours of the men who composed the Simon Commission."

This despicable attempt to discredit in India the Commission appointed by His Majesty the King Emperor and its distinguished leader might be treated with the contempt it deserves were it not for its harmful effects. Verily, the tolerance displayed by the Government of India passeth all understanding.

In the following quotation this British journalist

gives to his Indian readers his views on the commercial morality of his own countrymen :

“ I love all this talk about British trade, and the benefits it has conferred upon India and the spirit of self-sacrifice with which it has sold pianos and ladies' under-clothing. . . . I love the spirit of disinterested commercial morality which has gone on year after year paying whacking big dividends and taking millions out of the country. I like the way it has for years dominated the Government policy, so that all favourable contracts went to the European community. Of all the loathsome humbug in the world there is nothing equal to that of the big commercial concern whose sole interest is to make money anyhow and anywhere. It is responsible for all this flapdoodle which is talked about India; for the truth of the matter is that India has discovered weapons to advance herself to political freedom which are hitting the pockets of these Throgmorton and Lombard Street thugs ” (*i.e.* a semi-religious Indian society that lived by murder and the subsequent plunder of their victims).

Such a passage as above quoted is both unfounded and inflammatory. Cotton is perhaps India's greatest staple industry, and the bulk of the cotton mills are Indian-owned and run on Indian capital, although the Indian proprietors frequently employ British experts.

The great iron and steel industry is also Indian-owned and under British guidance, and with the assistance of British experience many important Indian industries have been developed in recent years.

These persistent attempts by one of their own countrymen to bring into contempt the British and

Indian Governments at a time of grave crisis, caused deep offence to Englishmen in India, more especially as coming from one whose experience of India was of merely three years' duration and was practically limited to Bombay and Allahabad.

CHAPTER VIII

BASELESS ALLEGATIONS BY AMERICANS CONTRO- VERTED BY AN AMERICAN

"THIS country . . . is not possessed by the sinister designs which Nationalist propagandists in India and the United States in particular so habitually attribute to it." (Ramsay MacDonald.)

The spirit of lawlessness that has been set in motion by the Indian National Congress has been stimulated by Bolshevist propaganda directed from Moscow. That perhaps was to be expected, as the proclaimed policy of Bolshevism is to bring about a world revolution, but I am at a loss to understand the gross misstatements on the Indian situation that have emanated from certain sources in America, both in speeches and articles. They have been seized upon with avidity by the Indian extremists, who in their ignorance believe them to be representative of the views and of the sympathy of the American nation. I give the following brief extracts from some of these speeches and articles.

The Rev. John J. Holmes writes as follows :

"MY PRAYER FOR INDIA

"I dream of her, I fervently pray for her, that she may no longer be in bondage to *strangers*."

The reverend gentleman ignores the fact that the British "strangers" have been in India almost as long as white men have been in America. He proceeds:

"With the stroke of midnight on December 31st, 1929, things in India began to happen—and have been happening ever since—the All-India Congress . . . formally *declared the independence* of India and raised to the breezes of Southern Asia the Indian National flag. Gandhi, the sainted leader of the people, pledged himself for the first time to "Swaraj," interpreted flatly in terms of national independence, and agreed to lead in person the '*non-violent*' revolt in India against the British Raj."

Of the Indian Statutory Commission's Report the reverend gentleman writes:

"This report came still-born from the press. It appeared beneath the engulfing flood of Indian ridicule and contempt and will not be heard of again. Meanwhile Britain keeps law and order through ordinance and the lathi."

I wonder whether the reverend gentleman ever heard how the United States restored order during civil disturbances in America.

Extract from an article in the *New Freeman*, New York:

"The only thing that interests us is—that a good many Indians are tired of British rule and want the British to get out, and mean to put them out if they can. This is enough for us; if they are wrong or acting from improper motives that is the Indians' business—it is not the business of the British to play second Providence for them."

The Bombay Congress Bulletin of the 11th September, 1930, published a Report of a Resolution moved by Senator the Hon. John Blaine of Wisconsin, in the United States Senate. Following a lengthy preamble of gross misrepresentations he moved the following resolution :

"That the Senate of the United States deploras such acts of violence, infamy and inhumanity committed by one signatory of the Kellog Pact against another signatory of the Peace Pact."

In moving the resolution Senator Blaine said :

"I have arranged in order a number of newspaper cuttings and articles in reference to the conduct of the British Empire in India—*which I assume are based upon facts*, and the facts disclosed by these newspaper articles and editorials divulge *the most atrocious conduct known to history on the part of a nation.*"

Comment on such a tissue of falsehoods which the Senator *assumes are based upon facts* would be wasted. If Mr. Blaine has any desire to learn the truth as to British rule in India, I would advise him to consult some of his responsible countrymen who reside there, such as the Consular Representatives of the U.S. and hundreds of others who, under British protection, enjoy exactly the same privileges as the subjects of the British Empire both British and Indian.

The Bombay Congress Bulletin of the 19th November, 1930, published a lecture on India by Dr. Will Durant, a former Professor of Philosophy at Columbia University, from which the following is an extract :

“The civilisation that was destroyed by British guns had lasted for fifty centuries. . . . The British conquest of India was the invasion and destruction of a high civilisation by a trading company, utterly without scruple or principle, careless of art and greedy of gain.”

It is a pity that Dr. Will Durant was not a Professor of History. He then might have had some regard for truth. In this case his “philosophy” has failed him, for a more base and grotesque perversion of facts was never coined.

In the Bombay Congress Bulletin of the 6th December, 1930, there appeared the following passage :

“FROM AN AMERICAN COMRADE

“Mr. E. H. James, an American journalist who recently arrived in this country, was one of those who witnessed the scenes of police terrorism and brutality at Azad Maidan yesterday. He later visited the two Congress hospitals and entered the following remarks in the ‘Visitors’ Book of the Free Emergency Hospital :— ‘The policy of foolish and petty persecution or the more high-handed methods of beating people, and shooting them down right and left, cannot possibly break the determination of the Indian people to obtain their freedom. As an American myself I am glad to record my sympathy with the Indian people in this struggle. My own country went through the same struggle as it happened, against the same tyrannical power which is to-day seeking to crush out the life of India. I can say with all my heart, and millions of Americans will say the same thing, Ghandiji-ki-jai.’ (Sd.) E. H. JAMES.”

I have stated already that large numbers of Mr. James’ compatriots enjoy in India under British

protection equal privileges with British subjects without the slightest discrimination.

I imagine, had a British subject visiting America intervened with similar bad taste and utter disregard for truth in a political issue of purely American concern, he would have been notified that he must leave the country forthwith.

It is refreshing to quote from another American source, viz. the Christian Science Monitor of Boston, U.S. (November 29th, 1910), views of a totally different character expressed by their correspondent, *resident* in India.

“So that Indian ryots or small landholders in an area of 7,500,000 acres may have water enough to guarantee the harvests of their tiny fields, the Government of India at a cost bordering on £16,000,000, about \$80,000,000, is completing a barrage across the River Indus for the purpose of impounding water to serve seven canals in a scheme which constitutes one of the world's greatest irrigation projects. In the course of centuries the Indus has turned the Province of Sind into a vast alluvial desert. Now the same river under the guiding genius of British engineers is about to make the desert blossom with great new cultivated areas. At a time when the British right to rule in India is being subjected to scrutiny in this country and elsewhere, it is a significant thing that during the past seven years forty British engineers and thousands of Indians have been quietly engaged in the development of the Sukkur project: *a scheme calculated to do more for the real Indian, the cultivator, than has ever before been attempted in Indian history*, and it is more significant still, that when repercussions of the political activities in the country touched Sukkur, Hindus and Muhammadans, including men, women and children, went with hands raised in supplicatory attitudes to ask these forty

white men for protection, and for four days the British forsook their work as dam-makers to act as peacemakers between the communal rioters. The Sukkur barrage and the Sukkur riots reveal at a glance the primary causes for the modern British connection with India. *The development of great benevolent projects and the keeping of the peace have been the chief characteristics of the British in recent generations.*"

The accuracy of the above view of the value of the British rule in India is supported in the following passage in the Simon Report :

"There is no part of the world in which more devoted work is done by Civil servants than in British India, and the reputation of their officers, whether British or Indian, with the mass of the people stands deservedly high, it ought to be effectively sustained. Whatever may be the future of this vast sub-continent, it seems to us very necessary that greater facilities should be provided for spreading a true version of public affairs, and for sustaining the foundations upon which orderly government must in all circumstances depend. It is one of the great claims of British rule in India that it has brought a peace and unity hardly ever before known in the peninsula, and has substituted for a congeries of warring States a single India united by a common allegiance to the Crown, although one part only is directly under British rule." (S. R.)

M. Louis Franck, Governor of the National Bank of Belgium, interviewed in Brussels on his return from his recent tour in India, referred to

"the economic marvels produced by the British during the past sixty years," and said, "the country was now well provided with railways, while 55,000,000 acres of barren ground had been put under irrigation. . . . Those who imagine that Great Britain is losing her Indian Empire are absolutely mistaken."

CHAPTER IX

EXTRACTS FROM INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS BULLETINS

THOUSANDS of these cyclostyled sheets have been published, or should I say "fabricated" daily, from the day Mr. Gandhi commenced his Civil Disobedience Campaign. The lies they contain are so vile and outrageous, that, if read only by intelligent people they would defeat the end of their inventors, but their object is deliberate and obvious, viz. to arouse by any means the passions of the people to the pitch of revolution. Unfortunately they circulate among masses of illiterate folk who, having no other source of information, believe them to be true.

It must be to the eternal disgrace of the Congress leaders, that they permit these wickedly false and inflammatory pamphlets to be issued under their authority.

13th May, 1930. "*It has been reported that soldiers, after shooting down peaceful citizens, went and kicked the prostrate bodies. Such is the Government of this country, established by deceit and repression and carried through organised violence. Each passing hour is bringing fresh evidence of the barbarity of the Government. . . . Beside the carnage of Sholapur that terrorism of the 'Black and Tans' in Ireland fade into the mist. If these are the canons of civilisation of the Britisher in India we would gladly prefer the ethics of*

apache or the humanity of the Thug. . . . Citizens of Bombay, can you stand unmoved while innocent children and helpless women are being slaughtered in cold blood merely on the whim of the police; can you continue to give support to an order of things that submerges all human codes and institutes a reign of terror? We appeal to you all to come and RALLY ROUND THE CONGRESS FLAG so that we may with one united attempt destroy British Imperialism and liberate India."

19th May. TERRORISM IN SHOLAPUR. "*It is alleged* that about 100 shops are broken open and looted by some British soldiers. Khadi people are thrashed and the vilest outrages are being committed."

29th May. "It is our declared intention to unseat His Majesty from the office of the Emperor of India, and we mean to do all our best to bring 'His Majesty's Government in India' into contempt."

10th June. BRITISH GOVERNMENT'S PROTECTING HAND. BABY CAUGHT BY THE LEGS AND HURLED IN THE AIR. "Peshawar is revealing its gory tale of Government atrocities. That innocent men and women were shot dead and trampled with armoured cars is an old story, but the cruelty still goes on. The soldiers have not even ruth for babies. A man carrying a baby was shot and the baby from his hand was snatched. . . . It was caught by its legs and hurled in the air. . . . Not only the world-famed British soldiers have lost their high honour, but they have by these atrocities proved themselves mean cowards, and that, too, of the lowest possible category."

5th August. "Britain's right to rule is the capacity of her degenerate sons to commit murder for no cause and under no provocation, and as each day passes by her law of governance is becoming more manifest in the unholy glee with which the representatives of His Britannic Majesty set about to torture and to kill non-violent, non-resisting Satyagrahis."

25th August. PESHAWAR. "Martial law is proclaimed to repress the national feeling of the bold Border-

land tribes. Bravo, Peshawar—thy name is on everybody's lips in thy struggle to get out of barbarous British bayonets, bullets and bombs . . . though we are far off and cut off from thee we sympathise and wish all God-speed to thy patriotic aspirations."

26th August. "We want no favour from this Government. It is a foreign incubus that broods death on the land, and we assert to-day that there is nothing as contemptible as to think of an amnesty from this British Government . . . we shall certainly one day open the portals of the jails to bring back our comrades, but it shall be when we have enthroned our Government. . . . These talks of peace are a consummate piece of treachery. It is the hoisting of the white flag merely that we may draw nearer, and when unprepared be butchered down. . . . When shall the world be purged of this infamy?"

29th August. "The Government are panting their dying efforts to crush the aspirations of Indians who have laid down in clear terms their resolution to win complete independence and to sever absolutely from the so-called British Commonwealth. Let the Government know this is a fight to the finish, and no compromise . . . is possible in spite of their vain and futile show of might. . . . There are thousands who are undergoing all sorts of maltreatment at the hands of the jail authorities, who have received instructions to torture the Satyagrahis . . . there are hundreds killed and murdered under deliberate instructions of the Government."

3rd October. "Now when . . . unheard-of tortures are being inflicted on a defenceless people, when the women of the land are being insulted and attacked, when children are being shot, when there is a virtual reign of terrorism, a few handful of men are proceeding to England to sit in a Conference with the acknowledged enemies of Indian aspirations. They have surrendered their nationhood and compounded their conscience. . . ."

21st October. GOVERNMENT PERSUASION AT PANVEL.

"Mr. Rajo, D.S.P. of Thana's methods of persuasion are in keeping with the tradition of British rule. He goes to a village, collects the men-folk, makes them naked, has them tied to trees and then mercilessly flogs them. They shriek with pain, they fall down senseless, but they utter no word except in defiance. . . . Bengal is the history of a reign of terror . . . of brutal assault on men and still more brutal molestation of women. . . . The sons of Belial were let loose by the Government and they committed indecent assaults on women. . . . The myrmidons of law and justice have looted and gutted villages."

24th October. "The newly-appointed officer, who is in charge of police operations in Bardoli, has evolved peculiarly demoniacal methods of inflicting cruelty. *It is stated* that he has issued written orders that any farmer who does not pay his tax is to be arrested, his hands and feet are then to be tied, and he is to be hung head downwards from a tree and severely beaten."

28th October. THE LORDS OF BESTIALITY. "The 'Lords of Misrule' are out for their orgy of blood and flesh . . . leading a dance of death and devilment. They have bayoneted the Quoran—burned the holy text-books—broken into homes—destroyed property—molested women—massacred men—in Peshawar and Sholapur made of the innocent heads of unwary little children targets for their shooting game."

10th November. "To-morrow the British Empire will observe the twelfth anniversary of the cessation of hostilities . . . and so with solemn rite and pompous parade England will repeat its annual lie, that all is quiet and that the world is at peace . . . so to-morrow at eleven o'clock we are to stand in silence to remember . . . that sickening death gambol that is England's rule. With bombs and aeroplanes, with rifle and gun, with lathis and lies, she is ruling India. To-day shattered skulls—broken limbs—bayoneted bosoms—massacred infants—despoiled women—desecrated shrines and be-spilled blood is the redeeming of England's word of honour to India. To-day the peace that she brings is

the murder that she does. To-day she kills and she leers. . . . We shall know no peace till British tyranny is crushed."

21st November. "The Congress has ever since the declaration of the WAR FOR INDIAN INDEPENDENCE thrown overboard even the last vestige of hope of being a limb in the Empire concept of the Imperial statesmen . . . and thus become a partner . . . in the repression and ruthless exploitation of millions of fellow-human beings all over the world . . . the history of British Imperialism is written in blood from Congo to Canton, and the stability of that Empire which is built on chicanery, fraud and force means living death to the oppressed peoples of the world . . . and constitutes the greatest menace to world peace. Indian nation as represented by the Congress . . . seeks to destroy the very fabric of that Empire on the consummation of which depends the redemption of the downtrodden peoples of the world."

24th November. "Talk to your hearts' content of Federal Constitution, swear as you like with republican accents by Mr. George or sing 'God save the King' and whine. The grim fact will yet remain that Britain has no intention to . . . deprive herself of her robber right to ruthlessly exploit this country. Amidst the princes and politicians that have crowded to London there sits the presiding deity of British administration . . . the grim gaunt skeleton that is the emblem of British Imperialism. And while yet the foolery of the Conference goes on, Britain is making preparation to meet the situation that will develop in this country, for they know that R.T.C. Delegates represent none but their little aspirations, and that India has entered on the path of Revolution and will not turn back till Britain's domination is crushed for ever.

"We have received information from England that the Army Headquarters have called up all demobilised men of the British Army who have seen service . . . they are drafting a new Army to be despatched to India who will be entrusted with the special task of

spreading terror in India . . . even men on the wrong side of sixty are being called up. The services of retired officers who have been in India have been requisitioned to train this Army. We vouch for the authenticity of this news and shall at some time in the future, when we are in a position to offer adequate protection to our informants, disclose the identity of these persons."

27th November. "The history of British conquests in India is strewn with acts of treacherous murders and fraudulent lies. The weavers of Dacca . . . were harassed to the extent of cutting down their thumbs. The artisans of South India whose ability to spin and weave created astonishingly smooth and nice yarn were done to death. These acts, with many more of a similar kind which have not come to our knowledge, were manifestations of a shopkeepers' nation . . . to get a wide market for textile industry of England."

1st December. "The British Empire—built on lies, massacres and exploitations—is fast crumbling down. The joke of the R.T. Conference can no longer be sustained. The grim guardians of the Empire are in despair. They tilt in vain against the rocky wall of the people's determination to crush the British Empire that has been a living death to India and an agonised dying to her sons."

19th December. "It is devilry, undiluted and naked devilry, that is let loose in India in the name of Christian civilisation. When the devil's work is done, Rev. Irwin may in his Christian honesty take the refrain from Cardinal Wolsey and say :

'Had I but served my God with half the zeal I served my country, He would not have left me so powerful to revel in the devil's rule.' "

2nd January, 1931. "Years back the glory of England borrowed the false glammers of a Satanic culture, spread over the world. Amongst her foul conquests was India, her supreme boast. But soon after its devastating effect, the living corpse of the Empire began to decay. . . . That sham glory was based on thunders of cannons and

shots of revolvers—wanton murders—and debauched actions. The might of the British Empire is fast gathering the hovering shades of darkness.”

21st January, 1931. “While most of the nominees of Lord Irwin are showering congratulations on Ramsay MacDonald on the achievements of the Round Table Farce . . . it is too late in the day to expect the awakened giant of the Indian masses to acquiesce in this intolerable solution of the problem. If Indian leaders in whom they have so far trusted fail them at a critical moment in India’s history they will not hesitate to resort to methods which will know no restraint of the type that ‘non-violence’ naturally places on them. The acceptance of MacDonald’s Swaraj is a most certain invitation to Communists to take the masses of India in their grip.”

6th February, 1931. “OUR CLAIM. COMPLETE INDEPENDENCE is our Goal and WE SHALL HAVE IT. By the deathless determination of the Indian Nation, the people of India have marched towards Swaraj and they have decided to have no half-way measures in spite of the malignant propaganda carried on by Anglo-Indian Press and the so-called Liberal or Moderate friends. . . . Independence and nothing short of Independence is our watchword and we shall have it at any cost.”

The foregoing extracts have been taken haphazard from the Bulletins that for months past have *daily* been circulated in thousands amongst an ignorant and therefore easily inflamed populace. Certain passages are so utterly vile as to be unpublishable. Congress leaders indeed must consider their case to be *in extremis* when they sanction its advocacy by means of such poisonous propaganda. Can any person with a balanced mind consider the passages above quoted to be consistent with a “non-violent” campaign?

CHAPTER X

THE MYTH OF INDIA'S IMPOVERISHMENT BY THE BRITISH

CONGRESS orators constantly preach that prior to the advent of the British, India was a land of plenty, and that British rule has impoverished the country, which is withering under the heavy costs of its administration. All the facts are diametrically opposed to this contention.

"There are critics who refuse to be convinced by evidence of advancing prosperity—they insist that India *must* have been impoverished by the "economic drain" she suffers in having annually to provide some £18,000,000 to meet the 'home charges'—the expenditure which is incurred in England—on behalf of the Indian Government. The use of the term 'economic drain,' of course, begs the question. *India renders no tribute to England* and the payments that she makes in England are for value received or for services rendered. Of the £18,000,000 thus expended, £6½ million represent the interest that is due to those who have lent money for the construction of the Indian railways, £3 million are the interest on India's public debt, and £1½ million is the price of Government stores which could not be purchased locally of equal quality and as cheaply. These all represent payments for actual value received. The railways fully pay their way; and their interest charges are obviously met not by the taxpayer as such, but by those who use railway transport for their own profit or convenience. It would, no doubt, be to

India's advantage if the shareholders, and the State creditors, were resident in India, and spent in the country the money they received. But Indian capitalists have not found railway undertakings an attractive investment; and had the lines not been constructed with English capital they would, for the most part, have remained unmade. Other countries which are compelled to look to foreign capital for their development would be thankful to attract it upon the terms that India can secure." (Sir Bampfylde Fuller, 1910.)

The figures in the above quotation relate to the year 1910, but the argument used is applicable to the present time. The wealthy classes in India, generally speaking, are averse to providing finance for new enterprises. They prefer outsiders to take the initial risk. For some time past the Government of India, in granting concessions that need capital to establish and work them, has made it a condition that on the Board of Control there shall be a majority of Indians and that two-thirds of any issue of capital shall be reserved for subscription in India. Only four or five years ago Government granted an important "public utility" concession on these terms to a company which, in accordance therewith, made its public issue offering two-thirds of the issue for subscription in India, but the response was negligible. Yet within a year or two the shares that the Indian public ignored were realising a premium of 200 per cent. This, having turned out a remunerative undertaking and the greater portion of the capital having been provided from England, would probably be one of the concessions which Mr. Gandhi and his colleagues are claiming the right to repudiate.

CHAPTER XI

CONDITIONS IN INDIA AT THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE BRITISH RÉGIME

FOR the information of those who may have been misguided by such false assertions as "The British Conquest of India was the invasion and destruction of a high civilisation," I quote the following passages from Beauchamp's translation of the celebrated work *Hindu Manners, Customs and Ceremonies*, written over a century ago by the great French missionary, Abbé Dubois, who spent over thirty years of his life in India from 1792 to 1823.

"The people of India have always been accustomed to bow their heads beneath the yoke of a cruel and oppressive despotism. If it be possible to ameliorate the condition of the people of India I am convinced that this desirable result will be attained under the new régime, whatever may be said by detractors who are ready to find fault with everything. . . . The justice and prudence which the present rulers (*i.e.* the British) display in endeavouring to make these people less unhappy than they have been hitherto, the anxiety they manifest in increasing their material comfort, above all the *inviolable respect which they constantly show for the customs and religious beliefs of the country*; and lastly, the protection they afford to the weak as well as to the strong, to the Brahmin as well as to the Pariah, to the Christian, to the Mohammedan, and to the Pagan; all these have

Into this hovel they with their wives and children crowd higgledy-piggledy—such, in truth, is the state of misery in which half the population of India passes its life. It is evidently absurd to suppose that a *well-meaning, just and equitable Government, which has succeeded one that was arbitrary, oppressive and tyrannical*, has produced no amelioration in the condition of the people—whatever peculiarities of character and disposition the latter may possess, *and however great an obstacle their institutions may be to the philanthropic endeavours of the new régime to make their lives more bearable if not actually happier*. This common-sense view of the case is borne out by my own observations.”

N.B.—The above are the independent views of a Frenchman written during a period when his country and Great Britain were at war. They describe the conditions existing in India a few years after the commencement of the British rule, and the improvements effected in these conditions even in that brief period. Testimony from such a source is a sufficient reply to the allegations of the American Professor quoted in Chapter VIII.

CHAPTER XII

CRUEL HINDU CUSTOMS ABOLISHED BY THE BRITISH

BUT for the urgent need to enlighten people who have been misinformed, I gladly would have omitted any reference to certain barbarous customs prevalent in India when the British régime commenced,—for the extermination of which the British are responsible.

As certain of these customs had prevailed for centuries past under authority of the Hindu religion, there is grave danger of their revival should the ban of British control be removed.

SLAVERY.

“Before 1843 there were many millions of slaves in India.”

In that year a most important measure of internal reform was passed (Act. V, 1843), “prohibiting the legal recognition of slavery in India; the law of India was thus brought into agreement with that of England.” (V. A. Smith’s *Oxford History of India*.)

SUTTEE.

In 1829 the Governor-General, Lord William Bentinck, carried Regulation XVII (despite the fact

that previously Government had "dreaded the reproach of interference with the Hindu religion").

By securing the passage of this Act,

"Lord William Bentinck affirmed the important principle that a civilised legislature might lawfully and rightly forbid acts which violate the universal feelings of humanity even when such acts have, as Suttee had, the sanction of immemorial custom, *Brahminical tradition* and to a certain extent of ancient scriptures deemed sacred. Although it may be and presumably is true that no section of Hindu opinion would now venture openly to demand the repeal of the legislation of 1829 and the authorisation of Suttee, the feeling in favour of the rite probably is not extinct—a case occurred in Bihar as late as 1905, and sporadic cases during the nineteenth century in various localities are on record. . . . The sacrifice was often, and especially in the case of Princes, compulsory, so that scores or hundreds of women might be and actually were burnt at the funeral of a single Rajah with or without their consent. . . . Between the years 1815 and 1828 Suttees were extremely numerous in Bengal, and especially in the districts around Calcutta. The worst year was 1818, when 839 burnings were recorded, of which 544 occurred in the Calcutta divisions. In 1828 the corresponding numbers were 463 and 309 . . . many unreported cases must have occurred. The evil, therefore, existed on a large scale and called for urgent remedy."

In 1844 Sir Henry Hardinge, the new Governor-General, devoted much of his attention

"to the suppression of cruel customs, including measures for suppressing Suttee and infanticide in the Native States."

"Among the Sikhs in the Punjab, Suttee murders were atrocious: four ladies burned with Ranjit Singh;

one against her will with Kharak Singh; two with Nao Nahl Singh; 310 (ten wives and 300 unmarried ladies of his Zenana) were sacrificed at the obsequies of Raja Suchet Singh; in September 1845 four wives of Jawahi Singh were forced on the pyre by the soldiery, and after Sobraon the widow of Sirdar Shan Singh burnt voluntarily. Sir Lepel Griffin in 1898 described that as being the last case in the Punjab. Infanticide was practised extensively." (V. A. Smith's *Oxford History of India*.)

THUGGEE.

"The Government of Lord William Bentinck has to its credit the suppression of a second semi-religious atrocity, the organised secret system of murder called Thuggee, which was practised by both Mohammedans and Hindus with the supposed sanction of the Hindu Goddess variously named Kali, Devi, Durga, or Bhawani. The initiated regarded their victims as sacrifices pleasing to that deity, on whose protection they relied with unquestioned faith. They never felt the slightest compunction or remorse for their crimes, however horrible. The system probably attained its highest development in the early years of the nineteenth century, during which thousands of travellers must have been slaughtered annually. One man confessed to having been concerned in the murder of 719 persons. The Thugs formed a secret Society extending over the whole of India. In every part of the country they enjoyed protection and aid from many chiefs, landholders and merchants ostensibly respectable. The moral feeling of the people had sunk so low that there were no signs of general reprehension of the cold-blooded crimes committed by the Thugs. They were accepted as part of the established order of things. The secret society of Thugs undoubtedly was extremely ancient.

"The Thugs, favoured by the insecure state of the roads and the lack of efficient police, travelled in gangs, large or small, usually unarmed and appearing to be pilgrims, ascetics or other harmless wayfarers. Murder

was usually effected by strangulation—which experience showed to be the safest method.

“Sir William Sleeman, K.C.B., took the most prominent part in destroying the Thug organisation. He was aided by many competent colleagues and supported cordially by Lord William Bentinck, who passed a series of special Acts to regulate proceedings of the officers selected to crush the gangs. During the years 1831–7, 3,266 Thugs were disposed of in one way or another; 412 being hanged and 483 admitted as approvers. The approvers and their descendants were detained for many years in a special Institution at Jubbulpore. Probably the chain of Thug tradition has been severed and the crime in its old form may be regarded as extinct, but *in India it is never safe to assume that an institution many centuries old is absolutely dead.* Cognate crimes, especially the poisoning of travellers by ‘datura,’ are still common, and I have tried or investigated many cases of this kind. Some of the ‘datura’ poisoners appear to be descendants of Thug families. The murder trade, like everything else in India, is hereditary.” (V. A. Smith’s *Oxford History of India*.)

MERIAH (human sacrifices).

“Sir Henry Hardinge also sanctioned systematic arrangements for the extinction of the horrible practices of human sacrifices prevalent in the Hill tracts of Orissa. The purpose of the sacrifices usually was to increase the fertility of the soil by burying bits of the flesh of the victims in the fields. The cruel rites varied in different localities. Campbell describes one which may be taken as a sample :

“One of the most common ways of offering a sacrifice in Chinna Kimeidy is to the effigy of an elephant rudely carved in wood fixed on the top of a stout post on which it is made to revolve. After the performance of the usual ceremonies the wretched Meriah (consecrated victim) is fastened to the proboscis of the elephant,

XII

IN

houts and yells of the excited Khonds and amidst the sound, when at a given signal by the is rapidly whirled the crowd rush in, seize the Meriah, officiating priest nives cut the flesh off the shrieking and with their life remains. He is then cut down, victim as long as and the horrid orgies are over. In the skeleton burn counted as many as fourteen effigies of several villages had been used on former sacrifices.

elephants which in 1854 no less than 1,506 Meriah

"Between 1837 and 1854." (*Oxford History of India.*)

victims were rescued

Warner, writing in 1904 (*Life of*

Sir W. Lee Dalhousie), says:

of Meriah passed entirely out of the "nor have cases of crime."

annals of Indian c

CHAPTER XIII

FAMINE—IRRIGATION AND EPIDEMICS

FAMINE.

OVER 70 per cent. of the population of India is entirely dependent on agriculture for its livelihood. If, as unfortunately periodically happens, the Monsoon is a failure, appalling famines devastate wide areas. In no direction has British administration proved more beneficent than in its efforts to mitigate the horrors of these calamitous visitations, which history records have recurred at intervals throughout the centuries.

Abdul Hamid, Shah Jahan's official historian, described the horrors resultant on the famine which occurred in the years 1630-2 in the following words :

"The inhabitants of these two countries (the Deccan and Gujerat) were reduced to the direst extremity. Life was offered for a loaf, but none would buy. Dog's flesh was sold for goat's flesh, and pounded bones of the dead were mixed with flour and sold. Destitution at last reached such a pitch that men began to devour each other and the flesh of the son was preferred to his love. The number of the dying caused obstruction on the roads . . . those lands which had been famous for their fertility and plenty now retained no trace of productiveness." (*Oxford History of India.*)

Other exceptionally severe famines occurred in 1660, and in 1770 in Bengal, when—

"the best estimates indicate that one-third of the population perished—the puny efforts of private charity, which seems to have been generous, could do little to alleviate the overwhelming distress at Murshedabad; the Resident reported that the living were feeding on the dead and that streets were choked with corpses—such scenes were no novelty in India, they had been witnessed many times throughout the centuries." (*Oxford History of India.*)

In more recent years the severest famines occurred in 1861 and from 1876 to 1878, when—

"the total area affected was estimated at 257,000 square miles with a population of more than 58,000,000. The excess mortality in British India alone was supposed to exceed 5,000,000, exclusive of the immense number of deaths in native states."

The famine of 1896-7—

"believed to have been the most severe ever known, was estimated to have affected a population of nearly 70,000,000. The calamity was fought as effectively as possible by Sir Anthony McDonnell, the Lieut.-Governor of the United Provinces. . . . No system can do more than mitigate the horrors of an intense and extended famine due to failure of rain in an enormous area."

Lord Curzon—

"at the very beginning of his term of office was confronted by a formidable famine which became intense in 1900 and smote with especial severity the favoured Province of Gujerat, usually exempt from such distress. . . . The calamity was encountered with untiring energy by the Viceroy and multitudes of brave men and women working under him, who often sacrificed their lives in the cause of the suffering millions." (*Oxford History of India.*)

IRRIGATION.

“ The carrying out of vast projects of irrigation has transformed many areas from the barest desert to fertile ground. The Sukkur barrage on the Indus will, when completed, bring water to a barren area in Sind, larger than the whole cultivated area of Egypt . . . between the great rivers are tracts which, if left to themselves, would be arid scrub country, incapable of supporting more than a few Nomads, but the efforts of a succession of great engineers have changed all this. . . . Irrigation has changed the Punjab from a poor Province exposed to recurring famines, into one of the most prosperous and progressive Provinces in India.” (S. R.)

“ The Mettur Dam on the Cauvery was inaugurated five years ago, and is claimed by the *Madras Mail* to be ‘ one of the biggest dams in the world ’ ; the reservoir of which it will be the custodian will have a capacity exceeded by only two other reservoirs in creation. The work should be completed by the end of 1933, and when finished will add another mighty achievement to the group of stupendous works laid down by the present ‘ Satanic ’ Government.” (*The Statesman*, 11.11.30.)

“ The Lloyd Dam, south of Poona, is another great work, containing indeed a larger mass of masonry than the Assouan Dam itself.

“ The total area artificially irrigated in 1926-27 was nearly 48 million acres, of which over 21 million was from Government Works, and the total capital outlay on these works at the end of 1927-28 was over Rs. 111 crores (£83½ million). Many of the irrigation works in India were constructed as a protection against famine.” (S. R.)

When the above-mentioned new great irrigation schemes are completed the area under irrigation will be increased enormously.

EPIDEMICS.

British Administration has done an incalculable amount to mitigate the terrible ravages of plague and cholera, which in times of epidemic have decimated the population in the afflicted areas. The great plague epidemic which broke out in 1896 was introduced from China and was responsible for millions of deaths. The authorities

“tried to combat it by strict quarantine regulations, and other measures which offended the sentiments of the population, especially that of the Hindus. Violent opposition was aroused at Poona; two young British officers employed on plague duty were murdered deliberately, while sanguinary riots occurred at Bombay and other places. A method of inoculation with a serum has been efficacious when given a fair trial.” (*Oxford History of India.*)

Malaria is India's most insidious enemy. Its annual toll of death is staggering, but in addition it attacks and undermines the vitality of tens of millions, thus gravely impairing their efficiency.

“Malarial fever has reduced to stagnation the populace of large areas in Bengal.” (Sir Bampfylde Fuller.)

“The achievements of the Indian Medical Service in the study of tropical medicine have been remarkable. Sir Ronald Ross' work on Malaria is the most striking, but not the only example, and if such men are to have no successors the public health of India will pay a heavy price for it. It has been stated that deaths in India from preventable disease each year amount to five or six millions.” (S. R.)

Splendid hospitals for accidents, diseases, maternity cases, etc., equipped with every modern

appliance, are now available to the Indian public in all the big cities, and in recent years immense progress has been made in a great child-welfare campaign. In these good causes, the wives of the successive Viceroys and Provincial Governors have worked unremittingly.

CHAPTER XIV

INDIAN LABOUR

MR. R. S. SARMA, C.I.E., Member of the Legislative Assembly and Editor of the *Bèngalee*, wrote in that paper a series of articles between July and September 1929, after the Jute Mill strike, from which I quote the following sentences :

“ The exploitation of labour for political ends, which has been proceeding systematically and with greater and greater vigour during the last few months, is a danger of the greatest magnitude. . . . It is high time that the merciless exploitation of poor labour by designing politicians was thoroughly exposed. . . . The strike was started on the flimsiest of pretexts. It spread with lightning rapidity for which no one has been able to give a reason. . . . We have reasons to believe that the strike was initiated by intriguing politicians who fish in the troubled waters of labour discontent, in the vague hope of enlisting labour to swell the ranks of the enemies of law and established Government. . . . One of the ominous developments in the present-day situation is the anxiety of our extremer politicians to precipitate a conflict with the Government on the one hand, and on the other their anxiety to exploit labour to the utmost to gain their ends. . . . With Pandit Motilal Nehru speaking of the tremendous sacrifices for which the Congress is preparing, and losses already sustained being precursors of greater losses still to come, and his firebrand son (Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru) coquetting with communism as a social pastime, and toying with

I trust my readers will note that the prophetic passages I have just quoted voice the views of a distinguished Indian.

His assertion that the National Congress Party are out to exploit labour to gain their ends, is proven by the following extract from their official organ, the Bombay Provincial Congress Bulletin of the 21st July, 1930 :

"The B.P.C.C. have opened a labour office at Parel to carry on Congress propaganda among the mill-workers. The batch of students who have left their studies are actively engaged in this work under the direction of Professor Kosambi . . . they visit chawls (artisans' dwellings) or station themselves before the mills to get into intimate contact with our brothers in the mills and instil in them the Congress creed, which is the creed of the masses."

N.B.—Large numbers of mill-workers are of the Depressed Classes, but, far from being regarded normally as brothers by these student missionaries of Congress propaganda, would be regarded as "*untouchable*" but for the great temptation "*to enlist them to swell the ranks of enemies of law and of established Government.*"

Had the Government of India possessed Mr. Sarma's prevision and taken with promptitude such action as was necessary to preserve law and order, prevent intimidation and subversive and false propaganda, the history of the past twelve months would have been totally different, and the situation would never have been allowed to get out of hand.

The same writer expresses the view that—

“The Royal Commission on Indian Labour has been appointed out of the real desire to better the lot of the workers. If the workers really want to ensure for themselves a reasonable standard of living and comfort, the best way to obtain their object will be to put their case before the Commission in a consistent and logical way; but the intriguers know that if the workers do so and their conditions are improved, they will refuse to be tools in their hands. That is why they are anxious that the workers should boycott the Commission . . . it is now for Indian labour to choose its friends wisely . . . the Government can point as an earnest of its friendship to the Royal Commission on Indian Labour and of the legislation passed recently to ameliorate the conditions of workers. Labour is still in an unorganised state in this country, and hence unable to distinguish its real friends from pseudo-friends.”

CHAPTER XV

ARMY AND POLICE

"THERE were few periods in the recorded history of India anterior to the British administration, where over large tracts the internal peace was not greatly disturbed and the demands of the State on the land were not heavy to an extent which made its possession a liability rather than an asset. The first factor which changed the conditions which prevailed over the greater part of India up till the early years of the nineteenth century was the establishment of peace within the country and of security on its borders." (S. R.)

THE ARMY IN INDIA.

India, with a land frontier of 6,000 miles—

"has to carry a constant burden of anxiety and provide against actual dangers on the North-West Frontier which are wholly without parallel in the case of self-governing Dominions. India throughout history has had to endure a series of incursions by foreign invaders who have forced their way through the defiles in the North-West. . . . Notwithstanding the teeming millions of India's population, comparatively small bodies of invaders have often succeeded in overcoming all opposition and making their way through to the plains, where they have established themselves as conquerors. It is the difficult and necessary rôle of the army in India to guard against a repetition of these dangers . . . 60,000 British troops and 150,000 Indian troops . . . are organised into a field army, with covering troops, and with

a garrison for internal security. From 1850 to 1922 there have been 72 expeditions against (raiding tribes from across the North-West Frontier)—an average of one a year. . . . Behind and beyond this belt of unorganised territory lies the direction from which throughout the ages the danger to India's territorial integrity has come . . . a quarter, we may observe, occupied by States who are not members of the League of Nations. The question raised, and naturally raised by Indian political leaders, is whether the enormous cost of the army is justified (one British soldier is estimated to cost between three and four times as much as an Indian soldier), and whether, alike on grounds of economy and of Indian advancement, the British element in the army—or at any rate the command by British officers of units composed of an Indian rank and file—should not be materially reduced; but the army in India is not only provided and organised to ensure against external dangers of a wholly exceptional character, it is also distributed and habitually used throughout India for the purpose of maintaining or restoring internal peace. Police forces cannot be expected in all cases to cope with the sudden and violent outbursts of a mob driven frantic by religious frenzy. We have been told that on these occasions the practically universal request was for British troops; the reason, of course, is that the British soldier is a neutral and is under no suspicion of favouring Hindus against Mohammedans or Mohammedans against Hindus." (S. R.)

Speaking recently at Oxford, Field-Marshal Sir Claud Jacob said :

"The British soldier was the only man on whose strict impartiality all the conflicting sections in India could rely. India had not got the men who could take the place of our officers, and *the people who are agitating for the Indianisation of the Indian Army belong to those races who do not supply a single recruit to our army.*

Indians who take the place of British officers may be evolved in time, but they are not there to-day. . . . I do not see how we can possibly withdraw the British Army in India—if we do, the whole fabric of our administration in India will fall to the ground, for it depends on the army. I know that it is unpalatable to some people, but I am quite certain that I am right. We have the very insidious invasion of India by the agents of Russia, which is going to give us a great deal of trouble in the future if we do not tackle it immediately. Our army on the North-West Frontier has to be provided with munitions and supplies, and for this purpose the railways must be kept secure. For these reasons it would be criminal to withdraw the British element from the Indian Army and leave it to its fate.”

Speaking in the Legislative Assembly in February 1924, Sir Sivasawami Iyer observed :

“ As far as my reading of colonial history goes, none of the British Colonies was in a position to assume its defence at the time when a self-governing status was granted to it.”

On this, the Indian Statutory Commission comment as follows :

“ It may be true—but the point is that the Dominions are so placed that the practical risk did not exist—a man does not need to ensure against earthquakes where it is practically inconceivable that earthquakes should occur. In contrast with the Dominions, and indeed in contrast with almost the whole of the rest of the world, India presents an astonishing mixture, not only of competing religions and rival races, *but of races of widely different military capacity*. The Indian intellectual has, as a rule, no personal longing for an army career. The contrast between areas and races in India that take to soldiering and those that do not has no counterpart in

Europe. Whereas the most virile of the so-called martial races provide fine fighting material, other communities and areas in India do not furnish a single man for the regular army." (S. R.)

That the disparity in military capacity of the Indian races is not a recent development is emphasised in the following passage, written 125 years ago :

"However much the Hindus may have honoured the profession of arms and however full their histories may be of wars, conquests, sieges, battles, victories and defeats, it is nevertheless remarkable that no nation has shown at every epoch in its history so little skill in military science. When pitiless conquerors at the head of savage and warlike hordes forced their way over the northern mountains and spread themselves like a devastating torrent over the fertile provinces of India, the peaceable and docile inhabitants were unable to offer any effectual resistance; they saw their towns and villages ravaged by fire and sword, while rivers of blood ingloriously and fruitlessly spilt, deluged their fields. The readiness with which they bent their necks beneath the oppressor's yoke, and the feebleness of the efforts which they put forth to recover their independence, proved how inferior they were in courage and discipline to the proud Tartars who invaded and conquered them." (Abbé Dubois, 1806.)

It is noteworthy that Bengal, with a population of about 45 millions, does not supply one man for the regular army, and approximately that Madras supplies only one to 10,000 of its population; Bombay, only one to 3,000; the Central Provinces, only one to 2,500; whereas the Punjab, with a population of only 20 millions, supplies one man to 270 of its population and provides 62 per cent. of the whole Indian Army.

His Excellency Field-Marshal Sir William Birdwood, Commander-in-Chief in India, in his farewell Order to the Army in India (November 1930), expressed himself as follows :

“During my period of command, and especially during the last year, many calls have been made on troops, both British and Indian, to assist in the preservation of internal order, and the restraint, self-control, good-humour and sense of humanity displayed in carrying out this task, most unpleasant of all those that fall to a soldier, have evoked my unbounded admiration. As an officer of the Indian Army I particularly wish to place on record my pride and gratification at the steadfast and loyal behaviour of my Indian comrades in the face of *determined efforts made both in cantonments and in their own homes, to seduce them from their allegiance to their Sovereign.*”

The following extract from the Bombay Congress Bulletin of the 13th December, 1930, is a typical illustration of the manner in which the Congress is endeavouring to undermine the loyalty of the army.

“REVOLT IN THE ARMY

“‘A triple tragedy occurred this afternoon,’ says a Lahore message of 9th December, ‘on the battalion parade ground, Lahore Cantonment, when a Sepoy, running amok, shot dead Capt. P. J. W. McClenaghan of the 10th Battalion Eighth Punjab Regiment and a Havildar, and finally committed suicide.’—It is indeed regrettable that this piece of information is not given the prominence it deserves in the daily Press. Just as the now famous revolt of the Gharwal detachment in the Frontier against the arbitrary orders of the white officers to shoot down their fellow-countrymen who were engaged in the fight for the freedom of their country

found only a corner in the newspapers, this news is also treated with the same scant courtesy. News agencies, of course, studiously hide facts, particularly in such cases, lest the dissemination of such news should fan the spirit of revolt in the ranks of the army and the police. But the truth is that there is acute discontent in the rank and file of the army and police in this country, and it is only a question of time for this discontent to manifest itself in more demonstrable form. 'Ran amok' is the stock phrase of news agencies to explain away the significance of such incidents, especially when they occur in the ranks of the army and the police. The Lahore 'Sepoy's' conduct certainly is not a stray case of no significance. It is a demonstrable instance of the utter desperation the Indian 'Sepoys' are driven to by the generally humiliating and contemptuous treatment they are subjected to by white officers. We may not agree—in fact we do not—with the way it has been exhibited in this case; *but no one need be surprised if one fine day we witness a general revolt in the ranks of the army and the police.*"

POLICE.

The Police Department "is the target of much political attack in its work to secure the essential conditions for the enjoyment of all the advantages of citizenship, but if the question arises of removing a police station, the outcry which immediately follows, proves that the value of police protection is recognised. The Indian peasant is normally law-abiding, but he is capable under excitement, and in particular under religious excitement, of serious violence. Small store is then set on life and limb. Moreover, there are whole communities which are criminal by caste—theft is their recognised and only means of subsistence from birth to death. Even more dangerous, there are in some parts of India considerable elements in the population which on the relaxation of police control . . . turn to organised and violent crime on a wide scale. The interval which separates order from

anarchy in India is narrow, as the non-co-operation movement showed. The task of the police is made more difficult by the primitive state of communications in rural India . . . the area per policeman is five times as great and the population twice as great as in England. The number of superior officers is relatively small. For a total force of about 187,000 men there are roughly 1,000 officers. The absence of an active public opinion in relation to crime, and of that readiness to assist the police in emergencies which is taken as a matter of course in England, adds very seriously to the difficulty of the work." (S. R.)

Since the commencement of Mr. Gandhi's civil disobedience movement the police, with whom rests the responsibility for the preservation of order and the safety of the citizens from anarchy, have been subjected to a campaign of deliberate vilification—being accused of committing every imaginable barbarity.

Replying to allegations against the police made in the Legislative Assembly on the 28th January, 1931, Sir James Crerar, the Home Member, said :

" Here and now I say, on behalf of the Government of India, that they wish to express their gratitude and their high sense of appreciation of the services of the force, which has always shown the greatest devotion to duty and has displayed those qualities in *a higher degree during the past year than at any previous time.*"

CHAPTER XVI

INDIAN STATES

"IN 1922 Government promoted a Bill to prevent the dissemination of books and newspapers calculated to incite disaffection against Rulers of Indian States. *The Assembly took the strong measure of refusing to agree to the introduction of the Bill*, and the Governor-General was forced for the first time to bring into use the special powers of securing essential legislation entrusted to him by the Indian Act—he 'certified' the Bill, which was then passed by the Council of State." (S. R.)

But the inflammatory propaganda against the Rulers of Indian States is still sedulously fostered by the Indian National Congress. The following is an extract from the Bombay Congress Bulletin of the 7th June, 1930, the official organ of the National Congress.

"STATE PEOPLE ARISE"

"Citizens of the States . . . you should not lose the advantage of making the Motherland free from not only the yoke of the foreign bureaucracies, but also from the yoke of the *Princes and Rulers, who are worse than their white-skinned colleagues*, because they are traitors to their Motherland—to their brethren. Now the time has come to remove the petty, mean and base of the ruling Indian class, who are a shame to our ancient culture and philosophy. You have been underfed and

overworked all these years; for generations you have served with typical fidelity your Princes, never failing them in their time of difficulties, and they, following in the footsteps of the white lords, have little cared for your children and your farms. Now awake, arise, for now is the time for action."

Supporters of Congress openly proclaim that if they secure independence for British India they will make short work of the Indian States, but threats of this nature presumably do not perturb the Indian Rulers.

H.H. the Maharaja of Patiala, speaking at the Round Table Conference, I am sure voiced the views of the majority of his brother Princes, when he said :

"I make no secret of my own belief that the connection between my own country and the British Commonwealth is one that has been designed by Providence for the benefit of humanity at large. I feel strongly that the Indian States have it in their power to make a contribution no less valuable to the Great India of the future than the contribution of British India herself; nor is the contribution confined to an historic continuity of culture, a proud sense of citizenship, a solidity of political institutions, transcending differences of caste and creed. The Indian States can contribute something else which until the millennium arrives is no less important to the life of a country than the arts of peace, namely, *the capacity for self-defence*. It is in the Indian States that there still flourish most prominently such organised military life and tradition as still exist in India, and I suggest that in the future this may be found among the most practically valuable of the contributions that the Indian States can make to India and through India to the Empire. . . . May I here say with all earnestness that *I deprecate even casual*

references to the possibility that Indian States may be obliterated by the rising tide of democracy. The Indian States have survived many cataclysms, they may survive many more. In my view it is just their strength and vitality, their sturdy vigour which has carried them through so many trials, which gives them their greatest value as elements in the future polity of India and as links in those chains of common loyalty, common affection, and common interest which I pray may ever bind together Britain and India in the great British Commonwealth of free Nations."

The Indian States must be a dominant factor in any constitutional change designed to bring into being an All-India Federation.

There are 235 States of varying importance, the largest of these having an area nearly equal to that of Great Britain. Combined, they have approximately an area of 600,000 square miles and a population of 70,000,000. All the States of major importance have actual treaties with Great Britain as the Paramount Power. They manage their internal affairs, make and administer their own laws, impose, collect and spend their own taxes.

The Butler Committee, constituted two years ago to discuss with the Indian Princes their rights and privileges in relation to any proposed constitutional changes in India, stated in its Report :

"The States demand that without their own agreement, the rights and obligations of the Paramount Power should not be assigned to persons who are not under its control; for instance, an Indian Government in British India responsible to an Indian Legislature."

On the 8th February, 1921, when the "Chamber

CHAPTER XVII

POLITICAL UNITY OF INDIA

“GENERATIONS must pass before India is a Nation.”—
H.H. the Aga Khan.

Mr. Srinivasa Sastri, speaking recently at the Round Table Conference, said :

“It was the glory of Great Britain that she had taught Indians for the first time in 3,000 years (with two exceptions) to envisage India as a political unit.”

The exceptions to which Mr. Sastri refers doubtless were during the Maurya Dynasty, between 300 and 400 years B.C., and the Mogul Dynasty, some 300 years ago, but neither of these dynasties controlled the whole of India.

It is a striking and vital fact that in its history, covering thousands of years—

“ political union attained by the subjection of All India to one monarch of paramount authority never was enjoyed by All India until the full establishment of the British Sovereignty, which may be dated in one sense so recently as 1877, when Queen Victoria became Empress of India, in another sense from 1858, when Her Majesty assumed direct government of British India, and in a third sense from 1818, when the Marquis of Hastings shattered the Maratha power and openly proclaimed the fact that the East India Company had

become the paramount authority throughout the whole country." (*Oxford History of India.*)

In India a sense of unity is growing—

"but it is largely the outcome of the most recent stage of its history, during which the influence and authority of British rule *over the whole area* have made it possible to speak of India as a single entity. This tends to obscure to the casual Western observer the various assemblages of races and creeds which make up the whole. Two other influences making for unification must be taken into full account: one is the prevalence of English as a general means of communication among educated men in different parts of India (nearly all the debating in the various Indian Legislatures is conducted in English); the other is the growth of a passionate determination among the politically-minded classes of all Indian races and religions to assert and uphold the claim of India as a whole to a due place in the world. It would be a profound error to allow geographical dimensions, or statistics of population, or complexities of religion and caste and language, to belittle the significance of what is called the Indian National movement. True it is that it affects the hopes of a very small fraction of the teeming peoples of India. True it may be that the leaders do not reflect the active sentiments of masses of men and women in India, who know next to nothing of politics and are absorbed in pursuing the traditional course of their daily lives, but none the less, however limited in numbers as compared with the whole, the public men of India claim to be spokesmen for the whole." (S. R.)

With regard to the Congress leaders' claim to be spokesmen for the whole, I quote the following passage from a leader in the *Times of India* which I consider to be absolutely true.

"The fact is, and it is well known to these clamant champions of the Congress, that there really exists a very considerable section of the vast conglomerate of castes and creeds called the 'Indian Nation' that does not believe in the present creed and policy of the Congress. Take the Musalmans, for instance. Can anyone with any pretence to impartial judgment assert that the seventy millions of Musalmans—or seven millions for the matter of that, or even seven lakhs (700,000)—are whole-heartedly for the Congress movement? Can anyone in his senses believe that the sixty millions of the Depressed Hindus subscribe to the Congress creed? The very fact that the protagonists of the Congress regard it as the greatest degradation of the Councils to set up Untouchables as candidates and get them elected, is sufficient to damn the claim of the Congressmen to be the representatives and champions of the Depressed Classes. If, indeed, it were claimed that the Congress represents the most vocal and discontented among the politically-minded section of the vast Indian population, it would be possible to grant the claim. To anyone who has eyes to see it is clear that the apparent success of the Congress movement in bringing out large crowds in demonstrations is not due to any agreement with the constructive side of the Congress policy—as laid down in the Nehru report, for instance—but to the negative and spectacular, and therefore ephemeral and unimportant, part of it."

Shaukat Ali, one of the Moslem leaders, speaking on the 27th September, 1930, said :

"We Muslims have no faith in Mr. Gandhi or the Congress leaders. To-day Mr. Gandhi is a Hindu leader and is doing his utmost to make their domination in India complete."

In an open letter addressed to Mahatma Gandhi by Allah Nawaz Khan, the Nawabzada of Dera, he wrote as follows :

"Having lived in comfort, ease and peace for over a century we have forgotten the historic terrors of the past. . . . The rule of early Hindus, whether Muslims or Mongols, who established dynasties and settled in India, was marked by continuous internal warfare, famines and civil wars. The freedom of religion and personal liberty as it is now in India was unknown to the history of those times When the Moghuls were replaced by the English . . . the Hindus progressed economically, educationally and politically. . . . It was only Great Britain that really cared for the well-being of the masses and classes of her subjects . . . for a country like India, where the people are of various races, religions and culture . . . the spirit of impartiality can only be maintained by rulers of different race. . . . It is certain that if the British power were to be withdrawn from India, race would fight race, and religion religion, and involve in terrible disorders three hundred million people. Great Britain's connection with India has endured for two centuries. . . . To this connection India owes her prosperity, her peace, and her progress."

Dr. Ambedkar, presiding last August over the First Session of the All-India Depressed Congress, said :

"To give unrestricted power in the hands of people of this sort is to arm the hangman with a knife."

The Maharaja of Burdwan :

"I cannot imagine any other India, for a long time to come, but a BRITISH INDIA. It would be well for the British public to realise how very different an Indian electorate of to-day is from a British constituency. In fact, so different are they that *to draw a comparison between them would be useless if not mischievous.*"

CHAPTER XVIII

RECENT ABORTIVE PEACE NEGOTIATIONS

WHEN last summer Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Mr. Jayakar were permitted to negotiate with Mr. Gandhi, Pandit Motilal Nehru, and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, in the hope that they could persuade them to modify their demands and attend the Round Table Conference, and the attempt failed, the correspondence that passed between them was published. It is illuminating, as it clearly proves that the permission granted by Government to the negotiators was regarded by the three Congress leaders as a sign of weakness.

"They apparently assumed that H.E. the Viceroy by consenting to the negotiations had acknowledged their complete triumph, and that it merely remained with the victors to dictate terms to the vanquished. They hopelessly stiffened their attitude." (*Times of India*.)

"It is a regrettable fact that both Mr. Gandhi and Pandit Motilal Nehru have palpably moved away from their former position." (*Indian Daily Mail*.)

The Viceroy wrote to the negotiators :

"It remains my earnest desire, as it is that of my Government, and I have no doubt also that of His Majesty's Government, to do everything we can in our

respective spheres to assist the people of India to obtain as large a degree of management of their own affairs as can be shown to be consistent with the making of provision for those matters to which they are not at present in a position to assume responsibility. What these matters may be, and what provisions may best be made for them, will engage the attention of the Conference, but I have never believed that with mutual confidence on both sides it should be impossible to reach an Agreement."

I quote from the correspondence the replies of the Congress leaders to the Viceroy's gesture :

"With regard to India's right to secession at will from the British Empire and her right to refer British claims to an independent tribunal, all we are told is that the Conference will be a free Conference and any point can be raised there. . . . We are further told, however, that if the British Government in India were definitely faced with the possibility of the former question being raised, Lord Irwin would say that they were not to treat it as an open question. All they would do was to inform the Secretary of State of our intention to raise the question at the Conference. With regard to the other proposition (repudiation of debts), we are told that Lord Irwin could only entertain the idea of a few financial transactions being subjected to scrutiny. While such scrutiny may take place in individual cases, its scope *will have to extend to the whole field of British claims*, including, as we have stated, the *so-called public debt of India*. We consider both these questions as of vital importance. . . . If India is now to attain full responsible Government . . . it can only be on an absolutely voluntary basis, leaving each party to sever partnership or association at will. So long as the British Government or the British people regard this position as impossible or untenable the Congress must, in our opinion, continue to fight for freedom. The attitude taken up by the Viceroy over the very mild proposals

made by us regarding the Salt Tax affords a further painful insight into the Government mentality—the suggestion that those who ask for the repeal of the monopoly should show source of equivalent revenue adds insult to injury. It is as plain as daylight that from the dizzy heights of Simla the rulers of India are unable to understand or appreciate the difficulties of the starving millions living in the plains, whose incessant toil makes Government from such a giddy height at all possible. If the blood of the innocent people spilt during the last five months to sustain the monopoly of a gift of nature, next in importance to poor people only to air and water, has not brought to Government the conviction of its utter immorality, no conference of Indian leaders as suggested by the Viceroy can possibly do so.”

N.B.—“The Salt Tax was *not introduced by the Government* or by the East India Company: it was one of the taxes transferred to the Company with the Dewani of Bengal in 1765.” (S. R.)

The tax at present is Rs. 1.4 per maund, or approximately one farthing per lb. It produces a revenue of about £4,500,000 sterling, *i.e.* approximately 4*d.* per annum (one-hundredth part of a farthing per day) per head of the population. Can any impartial person contend that such a tax can inflict hardship on anyone?

“*The insult added to injury*” was the Viceroy’s suggestion that if Congress could suggest an alternative source of revenue, Government would have no objection to the abolition of the Salt Tax.

The following quotations are from the concluding paragraphs of the Congress leaders’ final letter to the negotiators :

“There appears to be an unbridgeable gulf between the British Government and the British Commonwealth

and the Congress. The Congress . . . resents and will resent with all the strength at its command the intolerable British domination."

The destructive tone and the temper of this reply to the Viceroy's generous and conciliatory gesture (which in the opinion of many exceeded the limits of prudence) were so impossible and uncompromising that they clearly indicated that these Extremist leaders had become bereft of any sense of proportion, and that unless they greatly modify the views they then expressed, and the impossible claims they make, they must be entirely eliminated from any voice in the settlement of India's future form of government.

The attitude of the Indian National Congress in relation to both the Sapru-Jayakar negotiations and the Round Table Conference is expressed in the following paragraph, which I quote from their Congress Bulletin of the 12th November, 1930 :

"British Imperialism, bewildered, beaten at every step, their trade greatly broken, their moral credit completely destroyed internationally, made abject overtures of peace to the Congress leaders in jail, which were promptly repudiated. Now on their last legs, the farce of a Round Table Conference with a handful of Indian flunkies and toadies is being staged in London. The nation looks with indifference and contempt upon this Conference. The Delegates may listen to the sermons of the British King and politicians and abjectly parley for more reforms. The Indian people had the choice between the begging-bowl tactics and the path of revolution, pointed out by Mahatma Gandhi. They have unequivocally chosen the latter path."

CHAPTER XIX

NATIONAL CONGRESS DEMANDS

THE Indian National Congress Party bases its demand for Indian independence of British control mainly on the contentions, that 150 years of British rule has enriched Great Britain, has impoverished India, has brought 300 millions of its people to the verge of starvation, has destroyed their liberties, and is mainly responsible for the fact that 90 per cent. of the population is still illiterate.

Mr. Gandhi is a visionary, but at the same time he is a singularly astute politician; he professes to stand

“for the ideals of the civilisation of India as against those of Europe; for the cult of the spinning-wheel and the simple economies of the village as against the factories, the railways and the ‘materialism’ of the West; but among his allies were many whose political and economic outlook and way of life were European. Mr. Gandhi never found it easy to define what ‘Swaraj’ would mean in actual political practice; his accounts of it varied from time to time and were always nebulous.” He preached that “the existing Government and all it stood for were ‘Satanic,’ and the only cure was to end it.”

His method of obtaining his objective was through his plan of

"non-co-operation—refusal to pay Government dues, and organised mass disobedience to the laws and to the orders of the Administration. When the work of Government had been paralysed by these methods, nothing would be left for it but to abdicate." (S. R.)

It must be obvious to impartial observers that Mr. Gandhi's policy if it could be carried out would put back by centuries the clock of progress in India, and deprive the country of the benefits of the great scientific discoveries that have been introduced into India during the period of the British régime. To take only one instance, many millions of the poorest communities in India use the great railway systems, and cover in a day, distances that previously would have occupied a month.

"The most formidable of the evils from which India is suffering have their roots in social and economic customs of long standing which can only be remedied by the action of the Indian people themselves." (S. R.)

Recently I was impressed more than ever with the necessity for enlightening the British public as to the fundamentals of the Indian problem, when an English friend of mine informed me that an American gentleman who had recently returned from a tour in the East, had told him that the conditions under which the Indian masses exist are a disgrace to civilisation, attributing the blame for this to the British, adding, that in Burma the Burmese people lived under vastly better conditions both as regards cleanliness and food. My reply was obvious, viz. that Burma being under the same Government as India, any difference in the con-

ditions under which the peoples of the two countries live, must arise *from the difference in their customs and habits*. There is no caste system in Burma, and generally speaking the Burmese people unquestionably live under cleaner and better conditions than their Indian brethren.

The following words, written 125 years ago, are unfortunately to a great extent true to-day :

“ It is to my mind a vain hope to suppose that we can really very much improve the condition of the Hindus or raise their circumstances of life to the level prevailing in Europe . . . the efforts of a *Government which is humane and generous as well as just* may succeed up to a certain point in lessening some of their hardships, *but as long as it is in the nature of the Hindus to cling to their civil and religious institutions, to their old customs and habits*, they must remain what they have always been, for these are so many insurmountable obstacles in the path of progress and to the attainment of a new order of things, better calculated to bring them happiness . . . they will continue to grovel in poverty as long as their physical and intellectual faculties continue in the same groove.” (Abbé Dubois, 1806.)

Mr. Gandhi and his colleagues in their final reply to Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Mr. Jayakar, when the peace negotiations undertaken by these gentlemen broke down, wrote :

“ The age-long exploitation by the English of the people of this ancient land has rendered them almost incapable of seeing the ruin, moral, economic and political, of our country which this exploitation has brought about.”

Assertions of this character, through constant

repetition, have obtained widespread credence both in India and other countries, but being in complete opposition to the historical facts, it is high time that the truth be given equal publicity.

The quotations from independent authorities I have given in preceding chapters, I trust will convince unbiassed people that the allegation that British rule has brought about India's "ruin, moral, economic and political" is utterly unfounded, and that the following claim by the Simon Commission in the concluding sentences of their report, is fully justified :

"No one of either race ought to be so foolish as to deny the greatness of the contribution which Britain has made to Indian progress. It is not racial prejudice, nor imperialistic ambition, nor commercial interest which makes us say so plainly—it is a tremendous achievement to have brought to the Indian sub-continent and to have applied in practice the conception of impartial justice, of the rule of law, of respect of equal civic rights without reference to class or creed, and of a disinterested and incorruptible Civil Service. These are essential elements in any State which is advancing towards well-ordered self-government. In his heart even the bitterest critic of British administration in India, knows that India has owed these things mainly to Britain." (S. R.)

CHAPTER XX

THE FRUITS OF BRITISH RULE

THE benefits which the British connection has brought to India, could not be summarised more vividly than in the passages quoted below, which express the views of two distinguished men possessing unsurpassed experience of Indian conditions. Sir Bampfylde Fuller, K.C.S.I., wrote in 1910 :

“ Only a century ago the country was as a field that is ravaged by locusts. There was no Government, if we understand by the term an organisation which exists for the benefit of mankind. Such rulers as held their own exercised their authority for military purposes only, with armed forces constantly turned one way or the other, but over fully half of the country there was no established authority; and the people thought with terror of the next raid of the Marathas and Pindaris. Their only chance of relief was to take a hand with the plunderers. Little beyond a lifetime has passed since Maratha domination was ended. *In this short period we have established throughout a continent, a rule that in efficiency can be judged by a European standard, and in active benevolence surpasses many European Governments.* This is no small achievement. We have established peace. In present-day comfort we can hardly appreciate the greatness of this blessing. One must travel in the Near East to learn how industry fades if its fruits are not secured to it—how a land can be

sterilised by the fear of armed violence. We have safeguarded India from the incursions of the Afghans and Nepalese; we have allayed the hostile jealousies of chiefs within her borders, and during years now past, we have built up a protection for her against the ambitions of a European Power. . . . We have given security to person and property. Material wealth has greatly increased. There are critics who are so ill-informed as to deny this. Their contention is absurd. At the commencement of British rule, land had hardly any commercial value. It is now worth over £300 million, and those who hold it have been enriched by this amount. From irrigation works maintained by the State, 17 million acres are irrigated, an area half the size of England, and the lowest possible estimate of the increase in produce thus obtained is £30 million a year. (*N.B.*—Since this was written the irrigated area has trebled.) Railways have not only increased the money value of produce, they have stimulated land reclamation and by facilitating transport have secured the famine-stricken against the possibility of any actual shortage of food. During the last half-century the value of the Indian Export and Import trade has increased from £40 million to £200 million. The commercial classes have profited greatly. Millionaires are not unknown, and the prosperous appearance of the large commercial towns is a visible proof of the substantial incomes that are now derived from trade. The legal profession is flourishing. It is a creation of our own. Our army and public services afford a decent livelihood to hundreds of thousands. Half a million are employed in factories and another half a million on tea estates. It is not so easy to demonstrate that the poorer classes of villagers are better off than they were. . . . But if you will question men who know the country intimately, the European planter who has spent most of his life in India, or an Indian pensioner who grew old in service, they will laugh at the notion that poverty is now as great as ever, and will appeal convincingly to rises in

servants' and coolies' wages, and above all to the immense improvement that is evident in the people's clothing. Nor must we forget that for two generations India has been absorbing treasure at the rate of £15 million to £20 million per year. . . . We have established a judicial machinery and procedure which is as elaborate as that of any European country. It upholds . . . the sanctity of contracts, it gives redress for damages and it regulates the succession to property . . . the High Courts in particular are the most popular institutions the country possesses. . . . It is undeniable that the provisions of the Indian Penal Code have educated as well as disciplined. . . . By its punishments the criminal law has reinforced the dictates of religion and of society, and by its pressure has done much to convert maxims into habits. Such crimes as murder and dacoity are regarded more seriously than before. In some notable cases the law has expanded the moral code of the country. It has put an end to slavery, to widow-burning, and to human sacrifices, and it has nearly if not quite checked infanticide, though it is by no means certain that if its pressure were relaxed these practices would be found contrary to the public conscience. From time to time there are attempts at Suttee, which indicate that its prohibition is unpopular and that if we abandon the country it would probably revive. . . . The severest critics of British rule will not deny that its influence has increased the intelligence of the people. As the result of its educational efforts the number of college students has risen during the past half-century from about one thousand to 26,000, and the number of pupils at school from half a million to nearly 6,000,000. Newspapers are eagerly read and are published in large numbers. The writing of letters is becoming a matter of ordinary life, 700,000,000 annually pass through the Post Office. Railway travelling does much to sharpen the wits. In India it is cheap and popular. The number of passengers annually carried exceeds 320,000,000. By enabling the people

to travel freely and to correspond through the post we have not only stimulated their intelligence, but we have added very greatly to their general happiness. It is in India a novel idea that the State should expend its resources on the organised relief of distress. Until recent years famines seemed to be as uncontrollable as cholera or malaria, disasters whose effects were best passed over in silence. The Indian Government has undertaken to combat the forces of Nature, and if many perish, many more are kept alive. We have ventured to press vaccination on the people in opposition to their wishes. Small-pox is regarded as a visitation from the 'Great Mother' whose branding it is impious to resist. These scruples have given way before our perseverance, and now 8,000,000 of children are annually vaccinated. In these days it is only old people that are commonly disfigured by this disease. We have established hospitals and dispensaries throughout the country which give relief each year to 25,000,000 patients. When outbreaks of cholera occur, medical relief parties are organised and sent out to fight the disease by sanitary as well as remedial measures. A sustained campaign against the more insidious and destructive attacks of malaria has hitherto seemed too expensive and uncertain an enterprise, but, forlorn hope though it may be, an attempt is now to be made to lead it. For some time past the Government has distributed through the Post Office millions of packets of quinine at less than cost price. On a general survey then it must be conceded that we can give a good account of our stewardship. The well-to-do owe their prosperity to British rule; to the poor it has at all events given the blessings of peace; they can give their labour where and when they please. By using their freedom they have secured higher wages and they have no fear of being despoiled of their earnings."

N.B.—The figures given in the above quotation applied to the year 1910. With the cumulative

progress of the last twenty years they now would be enormously increased.

Lord Inchcape wrote a year or two ago as follows :

“ When one has travelled throughout the length and breadth of India and Burma, one realises what the British occupation has done for the country. When we took possession there was scarcely a track which could be called a road, there were no canals for navigation or irrigation, there wasn't until 1853 a mile of railway in the country. Justice was unknown. Thuggee and Sutte were rampant, murder and theft were rife. There was no postal communication and not a telegraph wire. There was no forest conservancy, no good water supply, no medical or police service, there wasn't an ounce of tea or coffee produced. There was no coal being raised, no oil, no manganese ore, no iron deposits worked, no gold found in the Wynaad, no silver or lead produced in Burma, no jute, cotton, woollen or paper mills in the country, no steamers on the rivers or coasts of India. British brains, British capital, and British enterprise have developed the resources of the country. The institution of civilised methods of Government and the suppression of crime have made the inhabitants comparatively safe, not only in the large towns but also in the jungles, and when people of different religions start killing each other, as they have been doing lately, we step in and stop them. They look to the British for protection. In the ‘ mofussil ’ (country) reliance is placed on the Magistrates, the Collectors and the Commissioners—living as they do their lonely and devoted lives in far outlying districts—for the maintenance of law and order and for the dispensation of justice.”

CHAPTER XXI

A PROBLEM OF PERPLEXITY

UNREST is a disease, and to remedy disease one must diagnose its cause. What is the cause of the existing unrest in India?

The Simon Report states that—

“A problem of great perplexity is presented by those of the Hindu middle class, who often at great sacrifice have been trained for clerical and professional careers in numbers enormously in excess of the amount of work of this kind which is available. It is not surprising that many of them turn for an outlet to the political arena, deeply imbued with hostility to the present régime.” (S. R.)

“In India the chances of Government employ, occupy the horizon of every youth of ability and provide his family with an engrossing subject for speculation. But generally the universities now turn out graduates much more rapidly than vacancies occur in the public service.” (Sir Bampfylde Fuller, 1910.)

Undoubtedly the sentences above quoted, define one of the main causes of the present unrest. This view is shared by at least one Indian gentleman who recently ventured to me the opinion that if all higher education could be suspended for twenty years, to allow the market for men of education to

absorb the surplus of aspirants for official, professional and clerical careers, which is continuously growing, it would do much to liquidate the spirit of unrest at present prevalent. That, of course, was merely intended as an indication of the cause of the trouble and not as a practical proposal for its remedy.

The only hope that the disaffection arising from this cause will in time evaporate, is that the restive section of the educated youth of India may come to realise—

(1) That if every official post held by an Englishman in India to-day, were filled by an Indian, it would only slightly reduce the number of disappointed aspirants for these posts.

(2) That had the Indian people given their whole-hearted co-operation in the working of the new Constitution, when it was inaugurated ten years ago, the process of Indianisation of the services would have been more rapid even than has been the case.

(3) That if co-operation now is given and civil disobedience ceases, in a comparatively few years the services will become almost entirely Indian.

(4) That the British nation will concede nothing to violence, which can only lead to anarchy; therefore, the present campaign of lawlessness is foredoomed to failure and is bound to recoil not only on its instigators and participants, bringing them nothing but suffering and material loss, but on millions of their poor illiterate and therefore easily misguided brethren.

CHAPTER XXII

SUMMING UP

IN the foregoing chapters I have endeavoured to compress within reasonable compass such information on the Indian problem as will afford those who have not had, and may not have, the time or the facilities to study it, a fairly comprehensive appreciation of its complexities.

Quotations I have given from distinguished authorities clearly prove, that in its long history India has never been a "nation" in the common acceptation of that word. On the contrary, India comprises a large number of diverse races with widely differing customs and creeds.

John Stuart Mill in his book on *Representative Government* wrote :

"When nations thus divided are under a despotic Government *which is stranger to all of them—which . . . chooses its instruments indifferently from all, in the course of a few generations* identity of situation often produces harmony of feeling and the different races come to feel towards each other as fellow-countrymen, particularly if they are dispersed over the same tract of country, but if *the era of aspiration to free Government arises before this fusion has been effected* the opportunity has gone by for effecting it."

In view of the bitter communal strife that still breaks out periodically, can it be claimed that this fusion has been effected between the diverse communities of India?

During historical times, that is, for rather over 2,000 years, only four Empires have held sway over the greater part of India—

“Inspired respectively by Buddhism—Hinduism—Muhammadanism and Christianity.” (Sir Bampfylde Fuller)—

and it is only the last of these—the British—that succeeded in bringing the entire sub-continent under one Dominion.

Allegations are freely made nowadays (and I am sorry to say even in America), that prior to the advent of the British, India was a land of peace and prosperity, and that “an ancient civilisation was destroyed by British guns.” The passages I have quoted in previous chapters conclusively prove that these allegations are utterly false, and it is lamentable that they should have been allowed to obtain such world-wide circulation without vigorous official contradiction.

It is true that for relatively brief periods, in its history exceeding 2,000 years, a large part of India has enjoyed an advanced state of civilisation and culture, as, for instance, during the Maurya and Gupta eras. When these periods passed, the country invariably relapsed into chaos, and for centuries its history becomes obscure.

Should the day come when the History of the

"Rise and Fall of the British Empire" has to be chronicled, then surely its outstanding achievement will be its righteous and humane rule of a country comprising one-fifth of the population of the world.

Recent events have proved that the extreme forbearance displayed by the Government of India, when revolutionary resolutions were passed by the Indian National Congress at Lahore on December 31st, 1929, was mistaken. A spark that then might have been promptly extinguished was allowed to smoulder until fanned into a flame by gusts of popular passion.

"Our influence in India rests not so much upon our strength as upon prevailing ideas of our strength, and if anything occurs to weaken these ideas, the people prepare themselves for a change of rulers. . . . The traditions of a thousand years are not easily forgotten—during this period no dynasty has maintained itself much beyond the limit of a couple of centuries. . . . For this reason a policy of concession, of compromise, is exceedingly dangerous. *We must do justice, but because it is justice and not because we are afraid of the consequences. The idea of give and take which influences so materially the course of English politics is foreign to Indian notions of government.* It does not conciliate our opponents, it merely strengthens their hold upon the imagination of the people." (Sir Bampfylde Fuller.)

The resolutions passed by the Congress at Lahore on December 31st, 1929, expressed threats which Government at the time ignored. Three months later these threats were translated into action; Government by its altruistically tolerant attitude was running a grave risk.

"It is difficult to over-rate the influence of our public services if they remain *confident* in their loyalty. When supported by the Government they exhibit as a rule courageous independence of the feelings that may be agitating the country around them . . . but their efficiency depends upon their prestige . . . if an idea should gain currency that the Government is not prepared to uphold them, and will sometimes even sacrifice them to conciliate opposition, their hearts fail them, loyal enthusiasm deserts them, and they may even endeavour to make terms with revolutionaries." (Sir Bampfylde Fuller, 1910.)

Colonel Gidney, the distinguished leader of the Anglo-Indian community, one of the important Indian minorities, speaking at a meeting of Calcutta citizens convened recently to congratulate the Police Commissioner, Sir Charles Tegart, on his escape from assassination, said :

"Any evidence of weakness, timidity or sentimentality is sure to result in far more unrest than the passage of ordinances or suppressive measures such as Government have been compelled to enforce. Unfortunately for India there exists to-day an unprincipled lawless section of people that has *mistaken forbearance for weakness*, and taken advantage of the situation to substitute law and tranquility by a reign of terrorism and intimidation. This revolutionary movement, in which murder is expected to play a leading part, is gaining impetus with each new outrage. It therefore devolves upon us not only to condemn this unhappy recrudescence of revolution, but to urge upon Government that when any section of its people treats assassination as the cornerstone of its temple of liberty, it forfeits all right to be considered in any scheme of progress, that all reason for forbearance is gone and that every means must be diverted to the establishment of law and order."

The following words from an article that appeared in the *Evening News*, Bombay, aptly summarises the situation as it had developed :

"It is asking too much of human nature to attempt to conduct a lawless movement designed to bring authority into contempt, without inflaming passions which cannot be controlled. . . . No Government in any part of the world can afford to sit with folded hands when its army and police are incited to mutiny by an organised party in the country. No Government can tolerate for one moment an organised movement for the non-payment of its taxes. The moment it does so it will cease to be a Government and will have abdicated."

Whatever may be the result of the further negotiations which presumably will continue between the delegates to the recent Conference, with a view to adjusting the differences that exist between the communities they represent,—and if possible converting to reason the Extremists,—the time surely has come for the British Government to define the policy of Great Britain and to state in unmistakable language its final limits of concession ; specifically stating the conditions under which these limits can be reached.

I hope such a declaration would be as follows :

(1) We adhere to the pledge given by Order in Council on March 9th, 1921 ; this is the clause :

"For above all things it is our will and pleasure that the plans laid by our Parliament for the progressive realisation of responsible Government in British India, as an integral part of our Empire may come to fruition, to the end that British India may attain its due place amongst our Dominions."

(2) We shall welcome the co-operation of all those whose goal is the fulfilment of this pledge, to assist us in accelerating the attainment of that goal, and we will guarantee them immunity from persecution and intimidation.

(3) The Indian National Congress as at present constituted, shall be treated as an illegal body, and its intransigents will be held responsible for their illegal actions.

(4) We will sanction no form of self-government that does not afford adequate protection to all minorities.

(5) We will encourage to the utmost extent every effort to ameliorate the conditions and improve the status of the depressed classes.

(6) We will preserve under our own control, the conduct of Foreign Affairs, the responsibility for the defence of India, and the preservation of law and order, so long as we consider it necessary.

(7) We will never permit repudiation of Public Debts, nor of any obligations and concessions entered into by the Government of India or the Provincial Governments; neither will we permit unfair discrimination against British interests.

(8) We will not tolerate seditious propaganda either through the Press or other channels, and will punish rigorously all offenders.

(9) We will guarantee to all law-abiding citizens protection from intimidation.

Mr. Lloyd George, speaking recently when receiving the Freedom of Tenby, observed that he noticed

the name of Colonel Mathias of Dargai amongst those on whom a similar honour had been conferred, and said :

“ If we keep the spirit of Dargai *we shall retain Empire and be worthy of Empire*. It is only if our heart fails us that we shall lose it, and by doing so we *shall bring disaster*, not upon ourselves so much as *upon India itself*. One China is as much as the world can stand in a generation, and if we fail in India, *if the spirit of Colonel Mathias and others does not continue*, you will find that *India will be left to chaos and confusion until some strong hand goes there and rules India firmly and strongly*.”

Surely no one of British birth can call to memory without a thrill of pride the imperishable services to India and the Empire of that great array of Britain's distinguished sons, Statesmen, Soldiers, and Civil Servants, who throughout two centuries, in unbroken line of succession, have created and built up the British-Indian Empire—Clive, Warren Hastings, Wellesley, Wellington, Minto, the Marquis of Hastings, Cavendish Bentinck, Hardinge, Dalhousie, Outram, Lawrence, Colin Campbell, Have-lock, Rose, Dufferin, Roberts, and others whose name is legion. They have passed on—but in passing they have committed to this and to future generations the great trust of preserving and perfecting this splendid fabric, for the enduring welfare of India, the Empire, and indeed of the whole world.

On our generation rests this solemn obligation—the right way to discharge it is clearly defined. That great Conservative statesman, Lord Beacons-

field, addressing the House of Lords in 1881 in the last speech he delivered before his death, said :

“The key of India is London; the majesty of sovereignty, the spirit and vigour of your Parliament, the inexhaustible resources, the ingenuity and determination of your people—*these are the keys of India.*”

Twenty-seven years later, speaking in the House of Commons, that great Liberal statesman, the Rt Hon. John Morley, M.P. (afterwards Viscount Morley), then Secretary of State for India, said :

“There is, I know, a school of thought who say that we might wisely walk out of India and that the Indians could manage their own affairs better than we can. Anybody who pictures to himself the anarchy, the bloody chaos that would follow from any such deplorable step might shrink from that sinister decision.”

There *never* must be capitulation to the apostles of lawlessness; such a course inevitably would at one stroke destroy the noble structure raised by the genius, the patient effort, and the infinite courage of Britain's most illustrious Empire Builders—would relegate 60,000,000 of “Untouchables” to a state of slavery, and would thrust back into anarchy this great sub-continent.

The “*keys*” entrusted to us are still in our possession, and we must see to it that they are safe in our keeping.

Our one and only course is to strive continuously to bring into harmony the clashing interests of “a hundred Indias,” so that each, assured of equal justice and protection, will march forward with us

in loyal co-operation, and thus hasten the day when, as an equal partner, a contented, powerful and united All-India Federation will form one of the great pillars of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

APPENDIX

SOME IMPORTANT DATES IN EARLY INDIAN HISTORY

Supplemented with quotations from V. A. Smith's
Oxford History of India

ANCIENT Indian history, from times probably as remote as 4,000 years B.C., is legendary, but the year 336 B.C., when Alexander the Great invaded Northern India, marks the commencement of reliable data as to the chronological history of Northern India; no accurate data as to the chronological history of Southern India are available until 700 years later.

B.C.

322. Chandra Gupta Maurya founded the Maurya Dynasty.

"A huge Empire springs into existence, unifying the innumerable fragments of distracted India. The Kings, who may be described with justice as Emperors, are men of renown, outstanding personalities, whose qualities can be discerned, albeit dimly through the mists of time. Gigantic world-wide religious movements are initiated of which the effects are still felt. The manners of the Court, the constitution of the Government, the methods of administration,

the principles of law and the course of commerce under the Maurya sovereigns for nearly a hundred years in the fourth and third centuries B.C. are known to us in the twentieth century A.D. far more intimately than are the doings of any other Indian monarch until the days of Akbar, the contemporary of Queen Elizabeth."

B.C. ACCESSION OF ASOKA, Chandra Gupta's grand-
273. son.

"Asoka enlarged his Empire until it comprised the whole of India as far south as the Northern districts of Mysore, with the exception of Assam,"

but even he did not attempt to bring the Tamil kingdom under his dominion.

"The Maurya Empire lasted under a century. We next learn from Chinese sources of the beginning of an invading torrent from Central Asia which during seventeen centuries in successive waves of conquest overwhelmed India with floods of misery." (Sir Bampfylde Fuller, 1910.)

Brihadratha, the last Prince of the Dynasty, was slain by Pushamitra who founded in—

185. The Sunga Dynasty, which terminated when Vasudiva, his Brahmin Minister, contrived his death and seized the throne, establishing in—

73. The Kanvi Dynasty, which in the space of forty-five years had four Brahmin kings, the last of whom was killed by an Andhra king in—

28. The Andhra Dynasty, which was founded

in Southern India about 230 B.C., comprised thirty kings, and succumbed in A.D. 225 to the Kushan Dynasty (Kings of Kabul and North-Western India).

A.D. FOUNDATION OF THE GUPTA DYNASTY. This
320. period is regarded as the time of the Hindu Renaissance and is known as the Gupta Golden Age.

480. THE HUN ERA.

“Foreign inroads broke down the stately fabric of the Gupta Empire. The work of destruction was effected by hordes of Nomads from Central Asia who swarmed across the North-Western passes. The political system of the Gupta period was completely broken up and new kingdoms were formed. The history of India during the sixth century is exceedingly obscure, the times evidently were much disturbed. Soon after the middle of the sixth century the Hun kingdom on the Oxus was overthrown by the Turks.”

606-47. HARSHA of Kanauj reduced anarchy to order in Northern India.

“His death in A.D. 647 loosened the bonds which had held his Empire together, and a rearrangement of kingdoms was begun. *The partial unity of Indian history vanishes with Harsha, and is not restored until the closing years of the twelfth century*, when the extensive conquests effected by and for the Mohammed of Ghor brought the most important provinces under the sway of the Sultans of Delhi. During the four and a half centuries intervening between the death of Harsha and the Mohammedan conquest, in which no permanent foreign occupation

was effected except in the Punjab, *the countless Hindu States which took shape from time to time seldom were at peace.*"

A.D. 1176. The Mohammedan conquest of India did not begin until the last quarter of the twelfth century, if the Frontier Provinces of Kabul, the Punjab, and Sind be excluded from consideration. After 1340 the quick growth of the Hindu Empire Vijayanagar checked the southern progress of Islam and recovered some territory which had passed under Moslem rule, and from 1340 to the accession of Akbar in 1566 Islam lost ground.

1490. "The arrival of Vasco da Gama's three little ships at Calicut in 1498 revolutionised Indian history by opening up the country to bold adventurers coming by sea. The earlier maritime visitors to the coast had come solely for purposes of commerce. The Portuguese pointed out to their successors, Dutch, French and English, the path of conquest and so made possible the British Empire of India."

1510. PORTUGUESE CONQUERED GOA.

"The country (India) now is at the mercy of the Power which commands the sea, and could not possibly be held by any Power unable to control the sea routes. The strategical importance of the North-Western passes has declined as that of Bombay and Karachi has risen."

1556. ACCESSION OF AKBAR. Under Akbar and his successors the Mûslem frontier was extended from time to time until 1691, when the officers of Aurengzeb were able for a moment

to levy tribute from Tanjore and Trichinopoly. After the date named the Marathas enlarged the borders of Hindu dominion until 1818, when their power was broken and they were forced to acknowledge British supremacy based on the conquest of Bengal and Bihar (between 1757 and 1765). From 1818 to 1858 the Empire of Delhi was merely titular.

